DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 201 AL 002 207

AUTHOR	Allen, Virginia French, Ed.
TITLE	On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Series I.
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	65
NOTE	167p.; Papers read at the TESOL Conference, Tucson, Arizona, May 8-9, 1964
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.45
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education, Bilingualism, Composition (Literary), *English (Second Language), Instructional Materials, *Language Instruction, Language Programs, Linguistic Theory, Pronunciation Instruction, Reading Instruction, *Teaching Methods, Teaching Techniques, Testing

ABSTRACT

The contents of this volume, a compilation of papers read at the first conference of TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages), are grouped according to general subject and authors: (1) TESOL as a Professional Field--A.H. Marckwardt, F.J. Colligan, W.F. Marquardt; (2) Reports on Special Programs--J.E. Officer, R.B. Long, M.C. Streiff, D. Saunders. B.T. Estrada, J. Morris, D.I. Dickinson, E.M. Anthony, F. Ingemann; (3) Some Key Concepts and Current Concerns--H.B. Allen, J.D. Bowen, N. Greis, A.L. Davis, K. Aston, R. Strang, E.P. Dozier, L. McIntosh, E. Haugen, R. Roberts, S. Levenson, F.L. Bumpass, P.W. Bell, M. Finocchiaro, D.P. Harris, P.D. Holtzman, R.E. Spencer; (4) Materials: Their Preparation and Use--V. Komives, J. Jacobs, W.P. Allen, W.B. VanSyoc, W.R. Slager; (5) What to Do in the Classroom: Devices and Techniques--B.W. Robinett, J.O. Sawyer, R.C. Yarbrough, D.W. Danielson, J. Praninskas, D. Knapp, J. Ashmead. A Foreword by J.R. Squire, and an introductory address by S. Ohannessian preface the papers. See AL 002 208 for Series II and ED 002 064 for Series III. Papers from TESOL Conferences held after 1966 have appeared in the "TESOL Quarterly" as separate articles, not in series form. (AMM)

ED034201

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ON TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

VIRGINIA FRENCH ALLEN, EDITOR

AL 002 207

A PUBLICATION COSPONSORED BY: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA AND ITS CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
508 SOUTH SIXTH STREET CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS

ED034201

ON TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

Series I

Papers Read at the TESOL Conference
Tucson, Arizona
May 8-9, 1964

Virginia French Allen
Editor

Sponsoring Organizations

National Council of Teachers of English
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
Speech Association of America
Modern Language Association of America
and its
Center for Applied Linguistics

AL 002 207

published for the cosponsoring associations by

National Council of Teachers of English
Champaign, Illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Robert Harvey

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1965
by
National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61822

for

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
National Council of Teachers of English
Speech Association of America
Modern Language Association of America and its
Center for Applied Linguistics

CONTRIBUTORS AND EDITORS

Harold B. Allen, Professor of English, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Virginia French Allen, Lecturer, Department of English and Foreign Languages, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Walter P. Allen, International Student Adviser, University of Houston, Houston, Texas

Edward M. Anthony, Chairman, Department of Linguistics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; formerly Acting Director, English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

John Ashmead, Associate Professor of English, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania

Katharine Aston, Assistant Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Paul W. Bell, Coordinator, Special English, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida

J. Donald Bowen, Associate Professor of English, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California

Faye L. Bumpass, Associate Professor of Spanish and English as a Foreign Language, Texas Technological University, Lubbock, Texas

Francis J. Colligan, Director, Policy Review and Research Staff, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State and Executive Secretary, Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Dorothy W. Danielson, Assistant Professor of English, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California

A. L. Davis, Professor of English and Linguistics, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois

Donald I. Dickinson, Acting Director, English Language Institute, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii

Edward P. Dozier, Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

Beatrice T. Estrada, Language Coordinator, Tohatchi Public School, Gallup-McKinley County Schools, Tohatchi, New Mexico

Mary Finocchiaro, Professor of Education and Director, Foreign Language Institute and Puerto Rican Program, Hunter College of the City University, New York, New York

Naguib Greis, Instructor, Middle East Studies Center, Portland State College, Portland, Oregon

David P. Harris, Program Director, Testing of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), Washington, D.C.

Einar Haugen, Professor of Scandinavian and Linguistics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts; formerly Vilas Research Professor, Scandinavian Studies and Linguistics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Paul D. Holtzman, Associate Professor of Speech, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

Frances Ingemann, Lutheran Mission, Wabag, New Guinea; formerly Associate Professor of English and Linguistics, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Jean Jacobs, Americanization Coordinator, Sacramento City Unified School District, Sacramento, California

Donald Knapp, Associate Professor of English and Language Consultant, American University, Beirut, Lebanon; formerly Instructor, Department of English and Foreign Languages, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Valerie Komives, Teacher, Adult Education Department, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Michigan

Stanley Levenson, Curriculum Coordinator—Foreign Languages, Department of Education, San Diego County, San Diego, California

Ralph B. Long, Director, Departments of English, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico

Lois McIntosh, Associate Professor of English, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California

Albert H. Marckwardt, Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

William F. Marquardt, Coordinator, Programs in Teaching English as a Second Language, School of Education, New York University, New York, New York

Joyce Morris, Santo Domingo Public Schools, Algodones, New Mexico

James E. Officer, Associate Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Sirarpi Ohannessian, Assistant Director, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.

Jean Praninskas, Composition Specialist, University of Kabul, USAID, Columbia, ℅ American Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan; formerly Assistant Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Ruth Roberts, Assistant Professor and Senior Student Counselor, Student Counseling Bureau, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Betty Wallace Robinett, Assistant Professor and Administrative Assistant, Department of English, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

Duke Saunders, Elementary Supervisor, Los Angeles City School District, Los Angeles, California

Jesse O. Sawyer, Lecturer in Linguistics and Director, Language Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California

William R. Slager, Associate Professor of English, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

Richard E. Spencer, Head, Measurement and Research Division, Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois; formerly Supervisor, Examination Services, University Division of Instructional Services, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

James R. Squire, Professor of English and Counselor in the Teaching of English, University of Illinois; Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

Ruth Strang, Professor of Education and Director, Reading Development Center, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

Marjorie C. Streiff, Teacher, Wakefield Junior High School, Tucson, Arizona

W. Bryce Van Syoc, Associate Professor of English, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville Campus, Alton, Illinois

R. Clyde Yarbrough, Chairman, Department of Speech, Theological Seminary, University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa

SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

James R. Squire, Executive Secretary
508 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61822

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

Jeanne Brockmann, Executive Secretary
809 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

William Work, Executive Secretary
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary
4 Washington Place
New York, New York 10003

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

Charles A. Ferguson, Executive Director
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Foreword

As the papers in this manuscript make abundantly clear, the teaching of English as a second language is an important national as well as international concern. Perhaps not until the Tucson conference did the third grade teacher of Navajo children in a remote village of New Mexico recognize the affinity which he shared with the teacher of English to adults in the Philippines or to the Peace Corps volunteer in Nigeria. For years, of course, the teaching of English to non-English-speakers has been an important educational problem overseas and an issue of some moment in university offerings for foreign students in this country, but only during the past decade have the leaders of English teaching in this country addressed themselves directly to the problem.

The 1964 summer institutes for preparing teachers of English as a second language, authorized by the National Defense Education Act, were no accident but the logical result of testimony presented to the United States Congress during recent years by the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association of America, and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, three of the cosponsors of the Tucson meeting. The long-range commitment of NCTE to the field emerged clearly in 1960 with the beginning of its project to develop a six-year series of textbooks for teaching English as a second language. The English Language Section of NAFSA and of the Speech Association of America for long had provided forums for individuals with particular interests in the field, and the increasing efforts of the Center for Applied Linguistics to direct attention to the preparation of TESL teachers in this country led to several cooperative efforts.

In 1963, the NCTE sent to the NAFSA conference in Pasadena the chairman of its Committee on Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Robert L. Allen, to explore with NAFSA leaders the possibility of some joint effort which would bring together teachers from elementary, secondary, and adult schools and those concerned largely with university and overseas teaching. The discussion triggered the events reported fully in the first article in this collection and led directly to the Tucson conference. It seems fair to say that if the Tucson meeting did not identify the commonality of the problems which face teachers of English to non-native speakers, it at least provided a moment of self-realization for the profession of the gravity and significance of the problems.

A conference so dramatic in impact and so great in potential effect needs to be reported to the total profession. The planning committee is proud that that gifted teacher, Virginia French Allen of Teachers College, Columbia University, has assumed responsibility for editing. In preparing the manuscript she has been assisted by Enid M. Olson, Director of Publications for the National Council of Teachers of English.

No one association, no one individual was responsible for the conception, less still for the success of the Tucson conference. It represented a cooperative effort in the best sense of the word. Among those to whom the program chairman is particularly grateful are Sirarpi Ohannessian, Center for Applied Linguistics, whose continuing support and enthusiastic interest are reflected only in part in the conference report which she prepared for this publication; Ruth Strang, University of Arizona, whose calmness and dedication as local chairman of arrangements provided major assistance; Donald Knapp, then of Teachers College, Columbia University; Sheila Morrison Goff, Ohio State University; Margueritte J. Caldwell, Rincon High School, Tucson; Iris Mulvaney, Tucson Public Schools; and the members of the program committee listed in Miss Ohannessian's essay. To work with them was a continual reminder of the richness and resourcefulness of our profession.

JAMES R. SQUIRE
Program Chairman

December, 1964
University of Illinois and
National Council of Teachers of English

The TESOL Conference at Tucson

Sirarpi Ohannessian

The first national conference devoted to the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) was held at Tucson, Arizona, on May 8 and 9, 1964. It was sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), the Speech Association of America (SAA), and the Modern Language Association of America, together with the Center for Applied Linguistics (MLA/CAL).

The TESOL conference was the result of talks held among members of NAFSA, NCTE, SAA, and MLA/CAL at the Business Session of the English Language Section of NAFSA during the annual NAFSA conference at Pasadena, California, in April, 1963.

At that 1963 NAFSA meeting there was much discussion of the importance of reaching the different groups concerned with the teaching of English as a second (or foreign) language. Following a suggestion from Clifford Prator (UCLA), Charles A. Ferguson (CAL) agreed to call a meeting of representatives from various EFL programs "to determine the advisability of a different, more inclusive organization" for teachers in this field.[1]

Accordingly, on September 12, 1963, a Pilot Conference on the Advisability of an Inclusive Organization for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language was held in Washington, D.C., under the auspices of the Center for Applied Linguistics, with Dr. Ferguson as chairman.[2]

Participants at this pilot conference decided that a national conference be called on the teaching of English to speakers of other languages in Arizona on May 8 and 9, 1964, under the joint auspices of NCTE, NAFSA, MLA/CAL and SAA, with the following committee in charge of preparations: James R. Squire (NCTE), chairman; LeRoy Condie (New Mexico State Department of Education), Donald Knapp (TC, Columbia), Sheila Morrison Goff (Ohio State University), Sirarpi Ohannessian (CAL), George Owen (Detroit Public Schools), Pauline Rojas (Dade County Public Schools), and Mamie Sizemore (Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, Arizona).

This Planning Committee met three times prior to the Tucson conference (once in New York, a second time in San Francisco, and again in Chicago). Apart from these meetings, a great deal of work was done by Chairman James R. Squire. Without his guidance and energy, the intricate work of preparation for the conference could not have been carried out as smoothly as it was.

The Center for Applied Linguistics provided some of the advance publicity, such as the first brochure. CAL was also responsible for most of the mailing of publicity materials; with materials also mailed from Tucson and Champaign, in all probability some three thousand people received information about the conference. A poster designed by LeRoy Condie (New Mexico Department of Education) was distributed to a number of institutions.

Although the number of persons officially registered was 680, an estimated total of 800 persons participated in the TESOL conference. A look at the list of the 600 registrants for whom home addresses are available shows that, although the largest numbers came from the Southwest, there was a sizable representation from a number of other areas.[3]

---

[1] *NAFSA Newsletter*, XIV, 9 (May 15, 1963), 7.

[2] The participants included representatives from NCTE, NAFSA, SAA, MLA/CAL; the Bureau of Indian Affairs; the Bureaus of Elementary and Secondary Education in the Department of Education of the State of California; the Bureau of Community Education, Curriculum Research, New York City Board of Education; the Department of Curriculum Studies, State Department of Education, Michigan; the Dade County School System, Department of Education, Florida; the Division of Indian Education, Department of Public Instruction of Arizona; the Department of Indian Education of New Mexico; and the Université de Laval, Quebec, Canada.

Among those present were professors of linguistics, anthropology, English, education, psychology, and psycholinguistics from a variety of institutions of higher learning. Also attending were personnel from university departments responsible for the training of teachers of English as a second language, directors of various TESL programs and projects in government agencies, private institutions, and universities. There were official personnel from federal and state departments of education, principals of schools, coordinators of adult education, supervisors and consultants. In addition, there were numerous teachers of English to foreign students in universities and colleges, in adult evening classes, and in federal, state, or private school systems in areas of the United States where there are large numbers of non-English-speaking students.

In order to provide subjects of interest to as many people as possible, the program offered four simultaneous group sessions (sixteen sessions in all) covering a variety of topics. According to attendance numbers provided by some of the recorders of the sessions, the general demand appears to have been for basic general topics. Program I, for instance, on "Basic Concepts in the Application of Linguistics to the Teaching of English as a Second Language" is reported to have had an attendance of 300 persons. Even at a more specialized session such as "After Pattern Practice What? The Problem of the Intermediate Level Student," about ninety persons were present. Apart from these special sessions, there were meetings in which a number of distinguished speakers addressed the entire conference. There was also an informal get-together with representatives of eighteen associations and agencies who were available to answer questions and to give general information on the work of their organizations. Other such informal group discussions took place with consultants in a session divided into five discussion groups, each of which was devoted to the teaching of English as a second language—in the elementary school, in the secondary school, in adult education classes, in college and university classes—and in preparing teachers of English as a second language. The purpose of these discussion groups was to provide an informal opportunity to conference participants to ask advice on matters of special interest or concern to them.

Throughout the two-day conference, the attendance figures and the evident enthusiasm of the participants indicated that the conference was meeting a real need. Much of the success of the conference was due to the efficient work of the Committee on Local Arrangements in Tucson. Under Ruth Strang, its chairman, and with the energetic help of people like Paul Allen, Roby Leighton, and others, the Tucson committee handled registration, arrangements for hotel accommodations, arrangements for conference rooms, organization of meals and banquets, meeting of planes, and the hundreds of things that go into the running of a conference. The pleasant surroundings, the lovely climate, and the seemingly effortless capacity of the Ramada Inn, where the sessions were held, to expand in order to accommodate the ever growing number of participants were in no small measure responsible for the smooth running of the conference.

On the morning of the second day of the conference, James R. Squire called a breakfast meeting of representatives of the four sponsoring organizations to discuss future plans. The representatives agreed then that the present conference had obviously been well timed but that any move toward the establishment of an independent association of teachers of English as a foreign language would be premature at present. They recommended that a similar conference be called in 1965, cosponsored by the same organizations. It was agreed that any funds accruing from the Tucson conference which might remain (after all expenses were paid and after a report was printed and distributed to participants) should be held at the Center for Applied Linguistics and be available for use in the planning of the 1965 conference. Dr. Squire, as chairman, agreed to maintain the mailing lists and send a questionnaire to all participants at the Tucson conference to get their reactions to the 1964 conference and suggestions on possible future speakers and programs. The responses would serve as the basis of future plans.

---

[3] The breakdown for the 600 is as follows: Arizona, 266; California, 93; New Mexico, 47; District of Columbia, 30; Texas, 26; New York, 22; Illinois, 12; Nevada and Utah, 11; Michigan, 8; Colorado, 7; Indiana, Florida, and Minnesota, 5; Kansas, Iowa, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Puerto Rico, 4; Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Hawaii, 3; North Carolina, Rhode Island, and South Dakota, 2; and one each from Alaska, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, and Wisconsin. Three people came from Canada and from Mexico; one each came from the Philippines, Japan, and the Netherlands. Also, there were, among the numbers quoted above, foreign scholars and students who gave the addresses of their universities rather than their home countries.

The representatives recommended that some members of the present Planning Committee be involved in the preparations for the next conference but that some new individuals be added to it. They also recommended that the next conference be held at a different time, perhaps earlier in the year, and in another part of the country where the problem of non-English-speaking students in the school system exists.

In the afternoon of May 9, the scheduled Business Session and General Discussion took place with James R. Squire as chairman and Sirarpi Ohannessian as recorder.

In answer to a question on the possibility of an organization for teachers of English as a second language, Dr. Squire gave the meeting a brief account of the recommendations the representatives of the sponsoring organizations had made that morning at the breakfast meeting.

Discussion centered on three main topics. The first, mentioned above, was the possibility of an independent professional organization for teachers of English as a foreign language. There was general agreement with the recommendations of the representatives of the sponsoring organizations that the formation of such an association would be premature at present.

The second topic concerned the calling of a national conference in 1965. The group expressed strong approval for the Tucson conference and endorsed the morning's recommendation for a conference to be held the following year. One specific suggestion for the conference cautioned against having its programs overlap with those of NCTE and NAFSA. It was suggested that other groups, such as teachers of English to speakers of French, be included in future meetings and that consideration be given to holding the next conference in an urban area, perhaps on the East Coast.

The chairman announced that papers given at the Tucson conference would be published and distributed to the participants. A discussion on the third topic, that of publications, followed. The need for practical materials for the classroom teacher was pointed out. Conferees also discussed the question of a periodical to serve the profession as a whole. They drew attention to existing periodicals like *Language Learning*, *English Language Teaching*, and the *NAFSA Newsletter*. Mention was made of local publications in this field and the need for the dissemination of information on the contents of these. Suggestions were made for a bibliography of such publications or for a newsletter giving information on what was available. *The Linguistic Reporter* was cited as a periodical which, though it is devoted not only to English, usually carries a great deal of information on programs, research, and publications in this field. A periodical which would extract articles of interest to teachers of English as a second language from various journals was also suggested.

No decision was taken on a permanent publication connected with the conference, but the chairman announced that a committee would be appointed to study the matter before the next conference.

Subsequently, the four sponsoring organizations have agreed to cosponsor the 1965 Conference on the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (to be held in San Diego, California, March 12–13, 1965). Among the papers read at the 1964 TESOL conference, those which appear on the following pages have been prepared for publication by Virginia French Allen (Teachers College, Columbia University). Even in their necessarily abridged form, these papers bear witness to the high professional quality of the first TESOL conference and to the rich resources available throughout the United States for leadership in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD vii
James R. Squire

THE TESOL CONFERENCE AT TUCSON ix
Sirarpi Ohannessian

I. TESOL as a Professional Field

OLD PATHS AND NEW DIRECTIONS 3
Albert H. Marckwardt

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE—A GROWING EXPORT 9
Francis J. Colligan

ENGLISH AS VERBAL BEHAVIOR AND ITS SPREAD ABROAD 15
William F. Marquardt

II. Reports on Special Programs

ENGLISH IN THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN 21
James E. Officer

THE PUERTO RICAN EXPERIENCE IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE . 27
Ralph B. Long

REMEDIAL ENGLISH FOR STUDENTS FROM SPANISH-SPEAKING HOMES . . 32
Marjorie C. Streiff

HELPING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN LEARN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE 35
Duke Saunders

THE CHALLENGE IN TEACHING THE NAVAJO 37
Beatrice T. Estrada

SOMETHING TO TALK ABOUT—LANGUAGE LEARNING THROUGH EXPERIENCE 38
Joyce Morris

LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII . 40
Donald I. Dickinson

ENGLISH TEACHERS FOR THAILAND: A PEACE CORPS TRAINING PROGRAM . 43
Edward M. Anthony

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS 46
Frances Ingemann

TRAINING PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS IN HAWAII 49
Donald I. Dickinson

III. Some Key Concepts and Current Concerns

FACE EAST WHEN FACING NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS 53
Harold B. Allen

APPLICATIONS OF GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS TO LANGUAGE TEACHING . . 57
J. Donald Bowen

BASIC CONCEPTS IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE . 65
Naguib Greis

PHONEME AND MORPHEME 68
A. L. Davis

ANOTHER -EME IN LANGUAGE TEACHING: THE GRAPHEME 71
Katharine Aston

TEACHING BEGINNING READING—AN INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY . . 76
Ruth Strang

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE "PSYCHOLOGICAL REALITY" OF LINGUISTIC UNITS 78
Edward P. Dozier

FIRST- AND SECOND-LANGUAGE LEARNING 81
Lois McIntosh

BILINGUALISM AS A GOAL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING . . . 84
Einar Haugen

APPLICATIONS OF REINFORCEMENT LEARNING THEORY TO SECOND-LANGUAGE LEARNING 89
Ruth Roberts

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TO ADULTS—THE AUDIOLINGUAL APPROACH 93
Stanley Levenson

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS AND SEQUENCED STEPS IN TEACHING YOUNG CHILDREN TO READ ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE 95
Faye L. Bumpass

AN INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS 100
Paul W. Bell

THE SUPERVISOR'S ROLE IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT 105
Mary Finocchiaro

TOEFL: A PROGRAM FOR THE TESTING OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE 109
David P. Harris

CONTRIBUTIONS OF TESTING TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE 112
Paul D. Holtzman
Richard E. Spencer

IV. Materials: Their Preparation and Use

VISUAL GRAMMAR: AN EFFECTIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING *English for Today* 117
Valerie Komives

THE USE OF TEACHER-PREPARED MATERIALS 121
Jean Jacobs

INTERESTING THE INTERMEDIATE LEVEL LEARNER 123
Walter P. Allen

THE SCHEDULING OF CULTURAL MATERIALS IN LANGUAGE LESSONS . . 125
W. Bryce Van Syoc

INTRODUCING *Literature in English*: PROBLEMS IN SELECTING AND EDITING 128
William R. Slager

V. What to Do in the Classroom: Devices and Techniques

SIMPLE CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING PRONUNCIATION . . 135
Betty Wallace Robinett

PRONUNCIATION PROBLEMS 139
Jesse O. Sawyer

SOME PROBLEMS OF TEACHING AMERICAN ENGLISH TO INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN A THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY 141
R. Clyde Yarbrough

TEACHING COMPOSITION AT THE INTERMEDIATE LEVEL 143
Dorothy W. Danielson

CONTROLLED WRITING 146
Jean Praninskas

A FOCUSED, EFFICIENT METHOD TO RELATE COMPOSITION CORRECTION TO TEACHING AIMS 149
Donald Knapp

WHITMAN'S WINTRY LOCOMOTIVE, EXPORT MODEL 154
John Ashmead

I. TESOL as a Professional Field: Its Past and Present, and Some Possible Directions for the Future

Albert H. Marckwardt
OLD PATHS AND NEW DIRECTIONS

Francis J. Colligan
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE—A GROWING EXPORT

William F. Marquardt
ENGLISH AS VERBAL BEHAVIOR AND ITS SPREAD ABROAD

Old Paths and New Directions

Albert H. Marckwardt

May I say first of all that I feel complimented at having been asked to address this meeting. The very fact that you are assembled here today is both the fulfillment of a dream and a promise for the future. The dream has been that of establishing a sense of unity amongst all those who are engaged in teaching English as a second or foreign language—an activity which goes on in an amazing variety of guises and shapes. The promise for the future lies in the advances which this recognition of common interest and purpose may help to bring about.

Let me remind you at the outset that although as an organized profession we are very young, in fact almost waiting to be born, yet the teaching of English as a foreign language is very old indeed. It must have been no less than fifteen hundred years ago when the Angles and Saxons, firmly established in their beachheads on the Dover cliffs, the channel ports, and along the Thames, decided that it was easier to teach English to the defeated Britons than to learn their tongue. The instruction was undoubtedly crude, implemented upon occasion with a well-aimed kick or blow, but it seems to have been effective. I mention it only to recall to you the antiquity of our occupation.

I pass over the unhappy years of Norman French domination, but even here one cannot help marvelling at the vitality of English, which managed to do what British had not been able to do six centuries earlier, namely to survive the control and domination of invaders who spoke an alien tongue and to reestablish itself as a national language. By 1580 English was fifth among the languages of Europe, claiming possibly five million speakers, surpassed by French, German, Spanish, and Italian. Today, as you know, it dwarfs all of them, both in terms of its spread around the world and the number of people who speak it.

My mention of the date 1580 is important for another reason. It marks the appearance of what is very probably the first grammar of English as a foreign language, a book entitled *Le Maistre d'Escole Anglois*, written by one "J. B. Gentleman," who has been identified as James Bellot, a native of Caen. The author describes his book as "Conteyning many profitable preceptes for the naturall borne french man . . . to attayne the true pronouncing of the English tongue."

This aim is realized in part by means of careful instructions as to the placement and disposition of the articulatory organs; for example: "*Th* at the end of the word, is sounded in blowing with the tongue against the fore teeth. Example: *Teeth, With, Both, Faith*." The voiced counterpart of this interdental fricative, always a difficulty for foreigners learning English, is described as follows: "*Th*, are pronounced in blowing with the tongue against the fore teeth before sounding of them, and taketh the voice of one *Delta* both before, and after A, E, O: Example: *Father, That, Thether, Then, Mother, Thou*." Although the directive leaves something to be desired in terms of clarity and would certainly require some exceptions, nevertheless the attempt is laudable.

Another early laborer in the same vineyard was George Mason, who produced a *Grammaire Angloise* in 1622. He included in his work a considerable amount of grammatical material which represents a curious mixture of the realistic and the traditional. On the one hand, both *shall* and *will* are recognized as interchangeable future tense auxiliaries throughout the entire verb conjugation, yet at the same time he lists six cases of the noun, including the vocative and ablative. Conjugations are often given in phrase form, to wit: *I am a good man; Thou art a knave; He is a miser.*

A note of modernity is struck by the dialogues which are such as the author judged the pupil might find useful in making his way about the country. Here, presumably, are sentences to be put to use immediately upon waking in an inn:

> "Ho, boy, bring me some light: it is time to rise: it is almost day light: make some fire: warme my shirt."

Note the structure control. We have been confined to the imperative and to sentences beginning with *it is*. We continue with what is in effect pattern practice:

> "Give me my doublet—hosen, shooes, pointes, cloake. What is a clocke? Lend me a shooing-horne to put on my pomps: take away my slippers. Will you your bootes?—spurres? boot-hosen? Help me to tie my pointes. Reach me my garters. Brush my coate—hat, gowne, felt. Where be the brushes? Go fetch a basin and water to wash my hands. Bring me a cleane towel—napkin, handkerchief. Bring me something to break-fast. God be praised, I am ready."

We shall leave our traveller to his breakfast beer and cakes, pausing only to note that the first portion of the "practice of English," as this section is called appears in dual column arrangement, one of them consisting of the dialogues in a transliteration of French spelling, the other in English.

I may have taken too much time on what is to me an entertaining bit of pedagogical history, but I did want to make the point that English for foreigners as an educational activity was by no means born yesterday, nor were some of our pet tricks and devices. To a degree, at least, our paths are old and well-trodden.

Let us, therefore, attempt to determine the new directions in which we shall have to move by as careful an analysis of where we are now as time will permit. Among the battles substantially won is the firm establishment of the aural-oral method. We must look upon this, however, as being something more than just the establishment of a new technique in language teaching. It is the reflection of the linguist's approach to language, in terms of which the language as spoken and heard is recognized as primary, not only from the points of view of frequency of use, development within the individual and within society, but also as being the more direct reflection of the behavior patterns which constitute the language.

It is difficult to talk about this point, and I must confess that the linguistic scholars have not always done so cogently and coherently. One has to sense it, to feel it, rather than to know it in the abstract. And it is so easy to be deceived through our familiarity with spelling and with the entire writing system. Just three days ago I picked up a recently published book and discovered to my amazement that according to the author, a consonant cluster such as that at the end of the German word for autumn, *Herbst*, is, "un-English, not a part of the signalling system of the language." Though spelled with a *b*, *Herbst* is just as English as the final cluster of the word *collapsed*, which is what happened to the author's logic at this point.

Nevertheless, this focus upon speech has had a tremendous impact, not only upon English as a foreign language but on the teaching of the so-called uncommon languages, and even to a degree, though somewhat less noticeably, upon the teaching of the common foreign languages. The oral method has even been employed as a teaching device, rather than a pedagogical aim, in the teaching of classical Greek and Latin.

Actually our success here has been so marked that as a country we have gained the reputation in some quarters of having developed a considerable expertise in elementary language teaching at the expense of progress in the intermediate and advanced stages. There may be some truth in this; whether there is or not is a bit beside the point. What we must obviously do is to pay somewhat more attention than we have in the past to the written language, analyzing it first of all in terms of whatever differences in pattern from the spoken language occur consistently in different kinds of writing. This knowledge can then be applied with the same skill and ingenuity to the teaching process that has characterized instruction in the fundamental speech patterns.

Above all we must strive for a general comprehension of our purpose in emphasizing oral language command. It should be understood as stemming from a view of the nature and functioning of language basic to the science of linguistics, from a careful consideration of the educational objectives of language instruction, and from as much knowledge of the language learning process as we possess. But with respect to all of these, a further refinement and extension of our present knowledge is imperative. The direction that this should take toward the increase of our knowledge of the structure of written English has already been suggested. We shall, in addition, have to provide more and more, whenever we can, for diversification of instruction beyond the elementary level, reflecting differences in the purpose and educational justification for language study. And certainly we must come to recognize that the teaching of composition, even the writing of a business letter or one to the reader's column of a newspaper, is a cultural as well as a linguistic problem, and that there can be native cultural as well as native language interference with the learning process.

For the past two decades or more, those of us who have been engaged in teaching English as a foreign language have made much of the necessity of a contrastive analysis of the structure of the target language and the native language of the learner as a means of predicting learning difficulty. This emphasis was necessary in order to get the proper diversification of text materials and classroom approaches, and it afforded an apt illustration of the contribution that linguistics might make to language instruction. The idea has had general acceptance, and several distinguished research studies have been produced. Yet, we have been slow in translating these into simply written contrastive sketches which classroom teachers might understand and apply; without question more diligence is needed here. At the same time, I believe that we are at a point where we can modify our earlier doctrinaire position about contrastive analyses. For one thing, it is most dubious that we shall be able to compile, within a reasonably short time, studies contrasting English and every one of the native languages of the speakers to whom it is now being taught. Moreover, the differences, let us say, between a contrastive study of Ilocano and English and one of Visayan and English, may be confined to matters of incidental detail. If this is the case, would it be the best expenditure of time and effort to make another full-scale contrast between English and a third of these closely related languages? What we need, perhaps, is to develop a broader based type of study which will throw into relief the contrast between English and certain general language types.

We must recognize further that although the teaching materials may aptly reflect the contrastive analysis and be generally predictive of the kinds of language interference to be encountered, it is the teacher who makes the immediate applications and who needs to be constantly aware of the significant contrasts. Also, when the teacher is working with pupils of varied language backgrounds, no materials based upon a specific set of contrasts can hope to serve all the students equally well. Again the teacher is the key figure in the situation. Consequently it is in the teacher training process that the principle of contrastive study must assume a more important role than it has up to now.

Another area in which we have scarcely begun to probe the potentialities of contrastive study is that of culture. The acquisition of a second language is more than merely the ability to manipulate a complex of linguistic patterns, since the very organization of the patterns and the nature of the lexicon reveal, and to a degree, control the culture of the people who employ them. I have already suggested, for example, that the teaching of college composition to non-native students is a cultural as well as a linguistic problem, because of our insistence upon what might be described as a tight, naked prose for that type of writing. This is not necessarily the only way to explicate an idea, but it is the way upon which we have come to place a value, a way which runs contrary to that which is approved in some other cultures.

But more than stylistic considerations are involved here. There is a Weltanschauung as well, and this too is inextricably bound up with the meanings of words and the structure of language. Though English lacks the formalism of a polite and familiar pronoun of address to reflect what Roger Brown has called the dynamics of power and the dynamics of solidarity, it has developed a vastly more complicated system which involves the use of *Mister*, the use of surnames without *Mister*, the use of first names, the use of nicknames, the point at which one shifts from one to the other, and so on.

The matter runs even deeper than this. In a culture where one says *no* indirectly rather than directly, a plain unvarnished negative appears to be rude and inconsiderate of feeling. Conversely, to the American, the complex euphemisms for a refusal which he may encounter in places all over the world seem to him to reveal evasiveness, if not downright hypocrisy. We have all noticed how sad the jokes in a language textbook inevitably turn out to be. This is not wholly due to the fact that language textbook authors possess only a rudimentary sense of humor—if any. It simply means that humor is one of the last things that is translatable across cultures.

I could go on to illustrate this point at length, but it would be superfluous. The important thing is that, as soon as possible, we should set about the business of establishing a framework or model for the systematic comparison of cultures and begin to apply the results of such study to the teaching problems which many of us face, particularly in the intermediate and advanced stages of language instruction and in the interpretation of literature. It is quite as important for us to be aware of native culture interference with an understanding of Hawthorne or Thoreau as of native language interference with a mastery of verb pattern. This is a direction which we have scarcely begun to travel.

Also included among the battles substantially won is that of a more sensible attitude toward usage and correctness. There are several facets to this. To begin, we are generally content to derive the forms and structures we teach from the most authoritative factual sources on the language rather than a suprastandard existing only in the imagination or conviction of a pseudogrammarian, as was formerly the case all too often. In short, we accept as a standard, to use Charles C. Fries's expression, the usage of those who are carrying on the affairs of the English-speaking peoples, thus finding our justification for the kind of language we teach not only in fact but in social utility as well.

We are also making some progress in overcoming the reluctance of teachers of English in some countries to recognize as acceptable the American variety of English. There was a time when only the English of England, couched in the pronunciation recorded by Daniel Jones, was considered as valid pedagogical coin, but this has changed considerably. But it is no more sensible, let me warn you, for us to insist chauvinistically upon our kind of English. There is a reasonable middle ground here, which we have succeeded in maintaining in a number of places. Still more needs to be done, but the general picture is encouraging.

We have gone some distance in differentiating between the spoken and the written language, particularly in avoiding the egregious error of teaching for spoken use, the forms and patterns properly belonging to the written language. We have succeeded, I hope, in straightening out the distinction between speech and writing as functional varieties of the language on the one hand, and between standard and substandard or nonstandard cultural levels on the other. This is particularly important for those who are engaged in teaching English to immigrant groups or to their children, since their out-of-class contacts may be with substandard English to a considerable degree.

There is one further distinction that we shall need to deal with in the future more precisely and more effectively than we have been able to in the past, and that should probably be called a matter of style. It may interest those of you who know Martin Joos's book, *The Five Clocks*, that actually he first developed the stylistic analysis which the title reflects, in a book on the English language designed for students and prospective teachers in Jugoslavia. His so-called style scale recognizes five points or levels: intimate, casual, consultative, formal, and frozen. Joos identifies these in terms of the communications situation, including the number of persons involved, how well they know each other, and moves from there to the structural and lexical features of the language peculiar to each level.

For our purposes, what Joos has called the casual and the consultative styles are the most important. He characterizes the consultative style as, "our norm for coming to terms with strangers who presumably speak the same language; it is therefore an entirely public style and is marked by devices for facilitating understanding and cooperation in temporary groupings, notably the standard listeners' insertions—'Yeah, unhunh, that's right, oh I see, yes I know' and the 'well' that means 'now it's my turn to speak,'—and by the habit of supplying background information as needed, or even more than is needed." The casual style, less formal in nature, is "used among close friends and in working teams when there is no difficult information to be conveyed; it is marked by the use of slang and ellipsis." For instance, "He's not the man we want" in consultative style becomes "He's not our man" in casual, the use of *our* suggesting a common body of knowledge and assumption covering a specific situation.

Usually the casual style involves a somewhat smaller number of people. Moreover, a verbal exchange may move from the consultative to the casual level as the participants feel an increasing familiarity, and this move occurs at differing rates of speed in various languages. For this reason, levels of style become an important element in foreign language instruction. A distant and alien air is conveyed when a speaker who should be using a casual style maintains the features and patterns belonging to consultative discourse; conversely the substitution of casual for consultative may seem uncouth, unclear, and at times lacking in respect. A typical instance of the latter substitution occurs when non-native speakers of English try to use *kids* instead of *children* and simply don't know the situations where it is natural and permissible and those where it is awkward and unnatural.

Obviously both styles have a place in foreign language instruction, but both in our materials and in our teaching we must recognize the situations in which they are used and the language features appropriate to each. More than one textbook has made a family conversation sound like a parliamentary discussion, and upon occasion, though less frequently, casual forms have been intruded into a consultative situation. Here is an area in which we must walk circumspectly as we strike out in our new directions.

I have said relatively little thus far about the processes of language learning, but it is obvious that in our deliberations we must give some thought to these. I have always liked the classification by Edward T. Hall, in his *The Silent Language*, of ways in which the individual acquires his cultural heritage. Hall recognizes three kinds of learning: informal, formal, and technical. Those forms of behavior which are acquired through sheer imitation of either elders or peers are said to be the result of informal learning. Not infrequently whole clusters of related activities are learned at one time, often without an awareness that they are being learned at all or that there are patterns or rules governing the behavior in question. Formal learning consists of that which is taught by precept and admonition, in which the mentor instructs the learner in the use of patterns which he himself has never questioned. When the attempt to establish changed behavior is systematically placed in an intellectual context, is rationalized so to speak, the learning is technical.

It is a reasonable conclusion that each of these types has its place and function in the language learning process, although informal learning applies particularly to out-of-school rather than classroom situations. But certainly there are types of language behavior—the principal parts of the irregular verbs, for instance—for which any type of rationalization would be a waste of time at any level of maturity. There are other aspects of linguistic behavior for which some kind of rationalization could conceivably constitute an aid to mastery. Here, it seems to me, is a fruitful basis for the reexamination of many of our classroom practices. It is probably in the fixation of language forms and patterns that formal learning will be of maximum usefulness. Perhaps it is in the expansion of pattern that technical learning can play its most helpful role, both in warning the student of the pitfalls of inadequately controlled expansion and in making him aware of resources and potentialities of the language about which he might otherwise remain innocent. It is evident, moreover, that formal learning will lend itself more readily to the systematized procedures of programed instruction. Here, too, is a potential direction for the future.

As we review the development of language instruction over the past two decades, we can see that not all sectors of the profession have advanced at the same rate. Instruction in many of the uncommon languages has undergone marked change. New materials have been devised, ingenious methods of instruction have been adopted, and as a general rule, progress has been highly satisfactory. This has come about in many instances because there was no resistance from an earlier tradition or vested interests to overcome. In the commonly taught foreign languages, the changes date principally, though not entirely from the midfifties; in English as a native language they really have just begun. English as a foreign language has been fortunate in approximating the fluid situation that has prevailed with the uncommon languages. Our concern for the future must be to keep it that way. We must not permit even the newer tracks to become so firmly trodden that we hesitate to strike out adventurously in new directions when the already established paths seem not to lead us, or at best lead us only circuitously, to the desired goal.

The English Language—A Growing Export

Francis J. Colligan

Here, in America, the teaching of English to speakers of other languages is, I presume, at least as old as the courtship of Pocahontas. Only recently, however, has it become a substantial export—along with our wheat, our technical skills, our movies and TV.

The United States Government became interested in English language instruction on a broad basis only after 1938, when the Act for Cooperation with the Other American Republics authorized it to enter for the first time upon an official, continuous program of educational and cultural activities with other countries. Since the Second World War, it has continued to develop this activity as a significant item in our international exchange of knowledge and skills.

Proposals for the teaching of English were among the earliest government-supported projects, under the Fulbright Act, for example. Such proposals came from China in 1948 and, shortly thereafter, from Burma, Thailand, Greece, and the Philippines. As the program involved more and more countries, so too did requests in this field. In 1952, encouraged by the work of American grantees in the Philippines, the Board of Foreign Scholarships proposed to encourage that kind of project whenever it would fill a need. In the following year, it formulated a definite policy to further English language instruction overseas in coordination with other sponsors, both American and national. It emphasized linguistic science as a means of improving such activities on a long-term basis. It also stressed the teaching of teachers as the most efficient way of coping with the growing demand. As a result of this policy and of the expansion of the Fulbright program in the Middle East, Far East, and Southeast Asia, in 1955 more than 250 American and foreign grantees were annually engaged in study, research, and teaching in this field in 18 countries. Many of the foreign nationals were teachers and teachers of teachers from other countries who came to the United States to bring their professional training up to date.

If, outside Latin America, the Fulbright program opened the way for our government's efforts in this field, it was followed closely by other and larger projects, official and unofficial. Some grew directly out of it. A good example is the project of assistance to the Philippines in the improvement of instructional methods, which was sponsored by the University of California at Los Angeles. Started by Fulbright grantees, it was developed by the university under a five-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Today, the Agency for International Development, in continuation of this project, is helping finance the printing of textbooks and the training of forty-five specialists.

The Department of State and the Board of Foreign Scholarships with the academic exchange programs authorized by the Fulbright-Hays Act—our new charter for educational and cultural programs—still concentrate their efforts on university professors and secondary teachers and on English "refresher" work for prospective foreign students in our universities. They also sponsor seminars for American teachers going abroad and some of the government-sponsored seminars overseas for national teachers. The Department makes grants to American-sponsored schools overseas—schools which use English as a language, if not *the* language, of instruction. It has also worked with such groups as the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), the Institute of International Education, and several other organizations on testing the English language proficiency of foreign applicants for admission to our educational institutions. During 1963, it spent more than three million dollars on grants to more than 700 professors, teachers, and "apprentice teachers" in American studies, English, and linguistics.

The United States Information Agency (USIA) has the broadest program of English language training of any United States Government agency. Its activities are to be found in 71 countries throughout the world. In 1963, it reached nearly 300,000 adults. It has taught English to a broad sector of the foreign public for many years—to more than a million since 1953—in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It has done this within the general framework of its authorizing legislation and, specifically, its responsibility for "delineating" abroad "the life and culture of the people of the United States which facilitate understanding of the policies and objectives of the Government of the United States." While sometimes reaching into regular educational institutions, it has, in general, concentrated on the direct teaching of adults outside the formal educational system, serving also where feasible the local needs of other agencies of the United States Government. Its "Voice of America" broadcasts English language instruction. In many countries, it has institutionalized these teaching activities in United States information centers, libraries, and binational institutes, the doors of which are open to a wide range of individuals, including teachers.

Instruction ranges from beginning courses for a broad segment of the public to intensive advanced courses for participants in AID training programs, grantees under the Fulbright-Hays Act, and others who are planning to study here. It includes special courses for government officials, businessmen, and others with particular interests and needs. USIA supplies these programs with a wide range of texts, reading materials, films, and tapes. Language laboratory equipment is now being utilized in some of them. It sends out from Washington qualified professional personnel to conduct seminars for teachers and to assist individual country programs on a short-term basis. Teachers in these programs are of various types. They include the specialists in USIA itself, who are assigned to some posts abroad, personnel with grants from USIA who serve on the staff of binational centers, and Americans and other English-speaking persons who volunteer or are recruited on the spot. These last are numbered in the hundreds. During 1963, the USIA officers and grantee-personnel numbered 179.

United States technical assistance programs have brought about new needs for English language instruction and so have drawn the AID and its predecessors into this field. The process of communication is basic to the transfer of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are necessary for the social and economic development of many nations of the world. Language is the medium through which this process largely takes place. The teaching of English is, therefore, an increasingly important part of formal education in many of those countries. Within the framework of the AID program, it is especially noteworthy in that it facilitates the dissemination of technical and scientific knowledge to developing countries, thus contributing substantially to the achievement of economic development objectives. For these reasons, AID assists the governments and educational institutions of other countries to establish effective programs. It provides the technicians and specialists who are to receive technical training in English-speaking countries with a working knowledge of the language, and it helps improve the proficiency of key administrators and officials who need English for the successful performance of duties related to economic development.

Some idea of the scope of this effort may be gathered from a summary of AID expenditures between 1955 and 1963. During that period, the Agency obligated close to $17 million for English language programs. In 1964, it is spending almost $3 million, all but $600,000 of it overseas. As in previous years, it is spending this money in almost all parts of the world, with some preference for Africa and the Near East but with substantial amounts in Latin America and the Far East. In Turkey, the need for English language instruction has been met in part with the English language program of Georgetown University, which was begun on the university's initiative in 1954 and has been carried out since 1959 under contract with AID.

The Peace Corps is helping to supply the demand for classroom teachers in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. More than 1,400 of its volunteers are now teaching English in primary and secondary schools and in teacher training programs. More than 500 of them are working in countries where English is taught as a foreign language. The rest are helping to improve the English language skills of students in countries where some school subjects at least are taught in English; 500 of these are working in the Philippines. All of them are helping to narrow the gap between the enormous demand for English instruction and the inadequate supply of teachers.

In areas where the Armed Services maintain missions, notably under the Military Assistance Program, they provide military and technical personnel with specialized instruction in English to meet specific demands. In fact, the largest program of the United States Goverment in English language training is probably that which is conducted by the three military services—the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy. This instruction is directed toward the preparation of foreign military personnel to take part in training programs in the United States or at training centers overseas where English must be spoken. Furthermore, even some of the foreign military personnel who are not to train outside of their own countries must become proficient enough in English to read technical manuals and to work with American military assistance personnel. Then, too, the proficiency in English which foreign military personnel have attained in training must be maintained.

Of the three main arms of defense—all with programs similar in organization and purpose—the Air Force conducts the largest. Language teaching materials and equipment, with the services of technicians, are provided the foreign military establishment, and foreign personnel are trained in operating the equipment and instructing their own personnel. Advanced and specialized training in English is also provided in the United States prior to advanced military training. The largest installation in the United States devoted to advanced English language training is Lackland Air Base. It has an annual capacity of 2,200 students. Between 1953 and 1963, about 12,000 students from 50 different countries were trained at Lackland. Approximately 40,000 more have been trained in their own countries. Since 1954, 30 foreign countries have requested Air Force materials with which to establish their own English language training programs. At present, there are about 2,000 language trainers in operation at these AF-sponsored schools abroad. These represent an English language instruction potential of 4,000 students each day. In these schools students usually take an intensive basic course covering a period of fourteen weeks.

In October 1962, the Secretary of Defense directed the Secretary of the Army to establish the Defense Language Institute. This new entity was to take on responsibility for all language instruction—including English as a foreign language—in all the Armed Services. The Institute is a small organization designed to be a control center rather than an "operations" office. It is vested with technical control of all foreign language training (excluding, of course, language instruction in the Service academies). It has authority to approve course content and objectives, training methods, textbooks and other materials, and the qualifications of instructors. It has authority also to develop and apply standards for language aptitude and proficiency testing and to arrange scholastic credit. It is presently engaged in a full-scale review of English language instruction in all the Services for the purpose of recommending improvements.

Several nongovernmental organizations and agencies are also involved in English language teaching overseas. You know them, I presume, much better than I do. They include, for example, private American foundations like Ford, Rockefeller, and Asia Foundations, which are actively supporting programs in various parts of the world ranging from the development of textbooks in English for Indonesians to the financing of the English Language Institute in Hyderabad, India. They include some industrial firms, like ARAMCO, with comprehensive programs of English language teaching for local employees. They include several hundred American schools abroad, sponsored by American philanthropic foundations, business, church-related organizations, and community groups, which continue to teach English as they have for a century or more.[1] In the Near East especially, there are several American-sponsored colleges, some with affiliated lower schools. In Latin America alone, more than 300 schools enroll over 100,000 pupils every year.

Taken together, these activities, both governmental and nongovernmental, cover many countries. To many, they will seem impressive in scope and in scale. They fall far short, however, of supplying the demand. That demand, moreover, continues to increase. It is not limited to social or political elites. It has become much more general than that. Trade and finance, art and technology, medicine and health, military defense and diplomacy have all contributed to it and at all levels, just as they made pathways for the expansion of English as a mother tongue. Today there are new nations with new language needs. There are bigger and better educational systems in developing countries. There are more and broader interchanges of young people, scholars, newsmen, and others across national boundaries.

What is perhaps most important is the need for improvement in the quality of instruction. The make-do arrangements of twenty years ago will not do today. With proper appreciation of the work of countless men and women who have tackled the job abroad on an emergency basis—the teachers of other languages or in other fields, the wives of United States Government employees, and the rest—something more is needed now—more imaginative strategies, more ingenious methods, and, above all, more highly qualified personnel.

Let us then consider our resources. Our national experience in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages is unusually broad. While the market for such instruction was, until recently, almost entirely domestic, it was and is quite substantial—much more so than is generally realized. Many of us are surprised to learn that it is such a far-flung, nationwide enterprise. This year it is receiving additional recognition, for the U.S. Office of Education under the National Defense Education Act will finance two pilot institutes—at UCLA and the University of Puerto Rico—in the "domestic" teaching of English to our own people who speak other languages. English is still being taught to thousands of our Indian children. It is offered as a "foreign" language to well over a half million students who are regularly enrolled in the schools of Texas and California. It is being studied by thousands of French-speaking people in Maine. It is taught as a second language throughout Puerto Rico. It is being taught in the Trust Territories of the South Pacific. It is embodied in courses for new or prospective citizens offered by local school boards throughout the country.

With reference to the development of resources specifically for the overseas trade, much is being done by nongovernmental organizations. For example, the Ford Foundation has made a grant to Cornell University to increase the capacity of its Division of Modern Languages to train Americans as well as foreigners in the teaching of English as a second language and to staff overseas projects in this field. Attention should be called to the programs of several other universities which also have programs for the training of teachers of English as a second language. Six of them now have well-established programs devoted to the preparation of specialists in this field—Michigan, Texas, California (UCLA), Georgetown, Brown, and Teachers College of Columbia University. The Ford Foundation has also been the principal source of support of the Center for Applied Linguistics. Functioning as a clearing house and informal coordinator, the Center has provided leadership within the private professional community, and it has strengthened relations between the government and nongovernmental organizations and institutions. Notable also are certain other specialized organizations such as English Language Services, Inc.; the Laubach Literacy Fund, Inc.; Language Resources, Inc.; and Electronic Teaching Laboratories, Inc. By contract, grant or otherwise, several of these institutions and agencies work in close cooperation with our government.

---

[1] Here in the United States, as an "invisible export," so to speak, the English language is being taught to hundreds of foreign visitors who have entered, or are about to enter, our colleges and universities. About two-thirds of our 64,000 foreign students are from non-English-speaking countries. They can study English as a foreign language in more than 50 American colleges and universities. Some of them, more than 500, are, or are going to be, teachers of English in their own countries, and they are pursuing special training courses for that purpose.

Much more effort must be expended, however, if we are to get the most out of all these resources. Since the instructional skills in this field which we export represent not a surplus out of our abundance, but an item still scarce in the domestic market, we must, first of all, be even more selective in the future than we have been in the past. We must stress the training of specialists in the teaching of teachers, with organizations like the Peace Corps filling classroom needs in urgent situations, on an interim basis and, insofar as possible, demonstrating the most efficient methods. We must, in brief, invest abroad primarily in stepping up local production to the level at which it can take on the long-range job.

Again, in view of the imbalance between supply and demand, all sponsors, financial and administrative, should make additional effort to cooperate closely with one another.

There is already, I suspect, a viable consensus among the principal sponsors of activities in this field, as evidenced by the cooperation between governmental and nongovernmental agencies, that this is something which should be furthered on a long-term systematic basis. Such a consensus, however, if it does, in fact, exist, must be made explicit if significant gaps are to be filled, if available resources are to be fully used, and if the sum of all our efforts is to approach the totality of our responsibility. Once made explicit, it should be turned to good account. With such a consensus, ways and means must be found to pool our efforts and especially our resources in carrying out the necessary projects and programs. There must be a way of stretching our respective terms of reference, our charters, to encourage effectively joint or common use of available facilities and resources overseas. Somehow, fragmentation of our efforts must be minimized, and our total resources mobilized on a coordinated basis that can offer to those who finance the programs a clear-cut profile of this work.

There are grounds for some optimism. Much is being done in and out of government to coordinate these efforts. I have already described the Defense Language Institute as a device for coordinating these activities within the Armed Forces. On a broader front within the government, an informal interdepartmental group has been working effectively for some years. Right now it is helping to coordinate a survey of five countries. Last January, moreover, the Department of State joined with several other agencies to establish the interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. It consists of top-ranking representatives of the principal agencies involved in such activities; namely, the Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Peace Corps. It is chaired by the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, to whom the Secretary of State has delegated the authority assigned him by the President for the leadership of government-sponsored programs. It is hoped that the Council will do much to improve coordination of all such programs within the government. The Council is also interested in close liaison with nongovernmental organizations and agencies.

Outside the government, organizations and agencies like the Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs have done much to bring together the sponsors of English language teaching activities. The Center has organized a National Advisory Council on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. The Council meets twice a year to discuss programs with government agencies and to make recommendations to them. The Center has also stimulated the formation of the International Advisory Group which has as its primary purpose the exchange of information on second language teaching between the Americans, British, French, and others.

What is needed now is a systematic exchange of useful information among all agencies involved, governmental and nongovernmental, so as to make sure that all available resources and facilities are being fully utilized and that opportunities are not neglected because they are not known. Such liaison between nongovernmental sectors and the government is necessary. President Johnson's words to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce last April are appropriate here: "So your task and mine," he said, "are to make sure that . . . government functions."

Such liaison should also take in all our resources—those for domestic activities in this field as well as those formally or chiefly designed for the foreign market. This means, for example, that the fruits of the experience gained in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages in the United States be made available easily and readily to this international venture, making due allowances for differences between intergroup and international contexts. Within the government, perhaps, the U.S. Office of Education with its domestically oriented program under the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), on the one hand, and its internationally oriented work with AID and the Department of State, on the other, could demonstrate just how this fusion can be brought about.

Perhaps such exchanges of experience and skills could help forge out of all these varied efforts something like a corps of specialists in this field who could gain additional perspective on their professional activities by serving interchangeably at home and abroad.

It is in these terms that this particular conference is especially significant. It represents a growing awareness of the need for pulling together the facilities, resources, experience, and experiments of this far-flung professional enterprise, in its international as well as its domestic dimensions.

English as Verbal Behavior and Its Spread Abroad

William F. Marquardt

It has been said that the fate of more people depends upon the use put to English than upon the use put to any other language. This assertion, so widely accepted as true, seems to sidestep the fact that native speakers of English are outnumbered by native speakers of Chinese almost three to one. In the 1963 revision of H. L. Mencken's *The American Language*, English is credited with having 250,000,000 native speakers, as compared with the 600,000,000 speakers of Chinese.[1] Chinese is by no means a homogeneous language community. It has dialects whose speakers cannot understand those of certain other dialects. Nevertheless, there are 450,000,000 speakers of Mandarin Chinese who can communicate with one another vocally and, if they are literate, with all other literate Chinese as well, through a common writing system.

Why is it that English carries so much more weight in world affairs than a language which has more than twice as many speakers and which already had an established literary tradition when the ancestor of present-day English was the speech of a few thousand marauding Germanic tribesmen? Putting aside for the moment historical explanation, let us list today's practical reasons why English surpasses Chinese and every other language as an instrument of communication throughout the world.

1) It is spoken as an official native language by more than 250,000,000 persons in such strategically dispersed countries as Great Britain, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, Ireland, and the Union of South Africa.

2) About forty other nations located on every continent use it as an official language.

3) More publication is carried on in it in such crucial areas as journalism, science, technology, education, politics, and literature than in any other language.

4) It is the common language for aviation.

5) It is the most widely taught second language in elementary and secondary schools in non-English-speaking countries.

6) More persons speak it as a second language than any other language.

7) More literate persons speak it than any other language.

8) The two most technically advanced and communication oriented nations in the world—England and the United States—are its home bases.

9) It is the *lingua franca* of many multilingual areas and nations.

10) It is the language most commonly used in international conferences and in the United Nations.

11) It is the most common language of trade and commerce.

12) Knowledge of it is one of the surest ways to a position in government, business, or education in most non-English-speaking countries.

13) It is the language most needed for the operation of the governments of the new nations.

14) It is the language most widely used in travel.

15) It is the language most essential to military, naval, and air operations in most countries of the world.[2]

---

[1] H. L. Mencken, *The American Language*, rev. by Raven McDavid, Jr. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 763.

[2] For a fuller discussion of the factors related to the spread of English see Mencken, p. 763 ff., and also my article, "Breaking the Language Barrier," *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics*, XX (July 1963), 166 ff.

In addition to the practical reasons for the powerful grip English has on the intercultural transactions of the human race, it is said to have certain intrinsic merits which seem to be working on its behalf. Foreign scholars and statesmen have praised it for its "riches," its "good sense," its "terse convenience," its "masculinity," its "clarity, directness, and force," its "grammatical baldness," its "logical arrangement of words according to their meaning," its predominant subject-verb-object sentence pattern, its "lack of complicated inflections," its use of the single word *you* to address either the President of the United States or a three-year-old child, its huge vocabulary translatable into about one thousand common words, such as the BASIC English word list, and its low syllable-count-to-morpheme-count ratio. (A study reported in *The American Language* found that English used about one-fourth fewer syllables to translate the Gospel of Saint Mark than any one of forty other Indo-European languages did.)[3]

Far more frequently commented on, however, than the above named intrinsic qualities is one for which English has been so vehemently criticized by native as well as non-native speakers that one wonders why it is ever used at all, except by illiterates. The English writing system, or rather English spelling, has been called everything from *atrocious* to *zany* by great leaders as well as by the man in the street. Powerful statesmen and thinkers, such as Benjamin Franklin, Theodore Roosevelt, and George Bernard Shaw, have regarded English spelling as the chief obstacle to mankind's growth in rationality and to the widest possible use of the English language. Each of these men and thousands less famous have tried hard to make English writing represent more systematically the spoken form of the language, but with few permanent results. Yet within the span of years in which the three men mentioned above lived, the number of users of English in the world increased fivefold.

Despite this fantastic spread in the use of English, the crescendo of voices advocating intrinsic improvements in the language has become more strident. Frank Laubach, with his *English the New Way* spelling system, Sir James Pitman with his *Initial Teaching Alphabet,* John Malone with his *Compatible Alphabet,* and a host of others reveal how pervasive is the view that language is primarily a code rather than conventions of behavior, and that mastery of a new language is gained through learning to manipulate the code rather than through learning how to behave in the language.

If we examine, however, the first list given of the factors related to the present-day strength of English in the world—behavioral factors, we might call them—and compare them to the suggested intrinsic or code-related merits of English, we see at once that the factors on the latter list had much less to do with the ascendancy of English in the world than those on the former list. One can probably also infer from such an examination that language teaching theory and pedagogical techniques did not play a decisive role in aiding the spread of English. In former times as now, teaching language as a code rather than as behavior made the proportion of those who studied the language to those who ultimately behaved in the language rather small. All too frequently the teaching of English, as in the case of Latin, had an aversive effect on the learner and simply guaranteed that he would never again speak English with grace and pleasure.

If this overview of the spread of English abroad has any lesson to teach it may be this: The more we can make language teaching synonymous with inculcating verbal behavior, the more quickly will the learner begin behaving verbally as he wants to be able to do, whenever the situation he is in demands it. How does the inculcation of verbal behavior differ from the language teaching most widely carried on in recent years? Linguists have, after all, been telling language teachers for years that they must drill the structures and lexical items to the point where they become audiolingual response habits in the student.

---

[3] This discussion of the intrinsic merits of English is based largely on Mencken, p. 768 ff.

The difference between "inculcation of verbal behavior" and the pattern practice type of teaching is effectively brought out in two recent articles, one by Patricia O'Connor, "Linguistic Guidelines to Intermediate Foreign Language Materials," delivered in April 1963 at the Fourteenth Annual Linguistics Round Table, and the other by Clifford H. Prator, "English as a Second Language: Teaching," published in the January 1964 issue of *Overseas*.[4] Both articles suggest that language teachers have reached the end of the line in developing their ability to get students to manipulate language structures. Both call for application of concepts of communication theory to the task of helping the teacher bring the student as fast as possible beyond the manipulation of controlled vocabulary and structures to carrying on genuine communication in the language.

In a paper delivered at the recent CCCC conference, I described a simple experiment in extending the recommendations of Dr. O'Connor and Dr. Prator to a course in advanced composition for international students at Washington Square College of New York University.[5] In this experiment I demonstrated how composition can be used to give training in cross-cultural communication. I pointed out how instead of emphasizing outlining, paragraph construction, and sentence patterns, I emphasized getting each student to adapt his ideas and manner of presenting them to the interests and thought patterns of a specific group of readers from another culture. By showing each student on his first composition how the ideas he expressed might have value for some particular group if they were presented in a certain way, and then directing him to make his next composition a revision of the one returned and to aim at getting this particular group of readers to take some particular step, I tried to get each student to repeat his strengths on each successive composition and to eliminate his weaknesses. Having the student adapt basically the same ideas and similar language patterns for different audiences and for different ends tended to make these ideas and patterns seem more like effective communication behavior patterns than they would have if they had been drilled into the student through pattern practice. The improvement every one of the sixteen students in the class made in the ability to establish rapport and common ground on some vital current problem with a particular group of readers and then to lead them to some specific point of view or course of action suggests that proficiency in language is best taught as a concomitant of appropriate behavior in a communication situation rather than as a preliminary step toward it.

I will now list and comment briefly on practices and technology in use which I think could be modified and used more widely in order to make more learners effective in behavior involving interaction with English-speaking persons:

1) Use of techniques in teaching English to children abroad which will involve them in interaction among themselves in natural situations where such interaction is reinforcing. Professor Gerald Dykstra has a Teaching English as a Second Language Materials Development Project going at Teachers College, Columbia, in which techniques and materials for this approach are being worked out. Faye Bumpass also has a wealth of suggestions for bringing about such interaction in her book for teachers of English as a second language on the elementary level published last year.[6]

2) Use of situational films of the sort illustrated in the pilot model entitled *English*

---

[4] Patricia O'Connor, "Linguistic Guidelines to Intermediate Foreign Language Materials," *Report of the Fourteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, ed. Robert J. DiPietro. *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics*, No. 16 (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 125–232. Clifford H. Prator, "English as a Second Language: Teaching," *Overseas*, III, 5 (January 1964), 10–21.

[5] Advanced Composition in the English for International Students Course as Training in Cross-Cultural Communication." Presented at the 1964 Conference on College Composition and Communication at the American Hotel, New York City, March 26, 1964.

[6] Faye L. Bumpass, *Teaching Young Students English as a Foreign Language* (New York: American Book Company, 1963). See especially chs. VI–IX.

Face to Face worked out by Gerald Dykstra and Louis Forsdale.[7] The film shows a student from Ecuador asking two American students how to find the Teachers College building and trying to understand their directions and to respond to them. The scene is run through a second time with the foreign student's part left out for the learner to play. This prototype film would need to have added only some way of reinforcing the learner's responses—some way of showing him that he has responded correctly—in order to make it fit the specifications of reinforcement theory.

3) Use of light portable tape recorders and programed tapes to substitute for or supplement language laboratory drill. The programed tape would direct the learner to proceed along certain streets or through certain centers where verbal behavior is going on which is fairly predictable and which the learner can, therefore, be led to respond to and become more and more deeply involved in through the programed cues and reinforcements. For example, a tape might guide the learner through a department store and at first make intelligible to him transactions carried on at certain counters; then it might gradually lead him to make inquiries of the clerk about the price, construction, or usefulness of a particular item of merchandise. The portable tape recorders and tapes for rent by visitors at the American Museum of Natural History in New York are possible prototypes of what might be done for learners of English if reinforceable responses were elicited from them as they interacted with what they saw and heard. Some of my graduate students at New York University are experimenting with making a series of tapes for foreign visitors to the World's Fair. Their aim is to enable a portion of the thousands of visitors from abroad to improve their English while reacting to the wonders they experience at the Fair. This idea is worth developing to the utmost, and I would like to see funds made available for that purpose.

4) Use of the telephone as a means of bringing multitudes of learners into contact with multitudes of international minded informants in English on a one-to-one basis. With our present knowledge of programing techniques, it would be a simple matter to program interaction between a beginner in English and any ordinary speaker of English willing to give fifteen minutes or so three to five times a week at a convenient hour for a telephone exchange with the learner.

Through the use of these devices and procedures and many others even more ingenious already hinted at by TESL, an unlimited number of learners could be involved in real life communication situations in which they would make meaningful and reinforceable responses. Such intercultural communication is in itself a means of reinforcement, since it leads to possible benefits such as those I have listed as behavioral reasons for the spread of English abroad.

---

[7] Louis Forsdale and Gerald Dykstra, "An Experimental Method of Teaching Foreign Languages by Means of 8 mm. Sound Film in Cartridge-Loading Projectors," *Language Learning*, XIII, 1 (1963), 5–10.

II. Reports on Special Programs for Students and for Teachers

James E. Officer
English in the Education of Indian Children

Ralph B. Long
The Puerto Rican Experience in English as a Second Language

Marjorie C. Streiff
Remedial English for Students from Spanish-Speaking Homes

Duke Saunders
Helping Elementary School Children Learn English as a Second Language

Beatrice T. Estrada
The Challenge in Teaching the Navajo

Joyce Morris
Something to Talk About—Language Learning Through Experience

Donald I. Dickinson
Linguistics and Language Teaching at the University of Hawaii

Edward M. Anthony
English Teachers for Thailand: A Peace Corps Training Program

Frances Ingemann
Inservice Training for Peace Corps Volunteers

Donald I. Dickinson
Training Peace Corps Volunteers in Hawaii

English in the Education of Indian Children

James E. Officer

Although Congress appropriated funds for "civilizing" the Indians as early as 1819, five years before the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in the War Department, it was 1870 before it authorized an appropriation specifically for the education of Indian children. Even at the latter date, the Federal Government did not plunge wholeheartedly into the business of providing schools and teachers; rather, it turned much of that responsibility over to private institutions—primarily religious organizations—which it subsidized until 1901, when such subsidies were forbidden by Congress, certainly a decision which the United States Supreme Court in its present mood would applaud.

For all practical purposes, we can mark 1879 as the date when the Bureau of Indian Affairs became thoroughly involved in educating Indian youngsters, although prior to that time and, in fact, even before 1870, it had operated a few schools for tribes whose treaties had included provisions for educational facilities. However, it was in 1879 that Carlisle Indian School was established.

Carlisle was a boarding school, but the boarding school idea was not a new one. The different religious sects had been operating schools of this kind since the earliest days of the Republic. In fact, thirty-eight of them were in existence in 1825, the year after the creation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Early educators had favored the boarding school because of the migratory habits of the Indians and the lack of parental interest in formal schooling.

When the Federal Government finally moved into the Indian education field, it adopted the boarding school approach, but for an additional reason. There was a consensus in those days that the acculturation and assimilation of Indians required first the destruction of Indian culture. Many felt this destruction could best be accomplished through removing Indian children, even those of very tender age, from exposure to the traditional ways of their parents. The emphasis on boarding schools and on destroying Indian culture declined somewhat after 1900, but it was not formally abandoned until the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934.

It has always been difficult to evaluate the results of the "forced assimilation" experiment of the period after 1880. Although the Federal Government embarked boldly on the venture, it soon had second thoughts, and a study of the actions of the Congress and the Executive Department reveals a considerable amount of seesawing back and forth. To begin with, the very idea of coercing a portion of the population to accept something to which it was basically opposed did not meet with the approval of all Americans. The objectors made their feelings known to federal legislators and administrators, and caused them to hesitate in carrying forward the ideas which had been embodied in the Dawes Act of 1887, the major policy legislation of the period. Both because of the wariness of federal officials and because of the expense involved in creating enough schools to provide for the entire population of Indian youngsters (and in rounding up the children to fill these schools), the academic aspect of the forced assimilation experiment failed to reach many Indians. America's largest tribe, the Navajo, was scarcely touched by education at this time.

Another element which makes evaluation of the forced assimilation program difficult is the fact that those Indians who made use of their schooling to find jobs away from the reservations quickly passed out of sight. Much more highly visible were those who, bitter and disgruntled, returned to the reservation areas to pass on their dissatisfaction to contemporaries and descendants.

The deficiencies and inhumanities of the boarding school period were graphically outlined in a report made by the Institute of Government Research in 1928. Known today as the Merriam Report, this document recommended the abandonment of the boarding school as a major instrument of federal Indian policy and the substitution of public and federal day schools. These recommendations were largely translated into federal programs during the 1930's and early 1940's.

The new approach to Indian education after 1930 put the accent on enrolling the children in schools close to their homes, preparing teaching materials concerned with subjects familiar to the youngsters, and converting the school into centers of community activity for both children and adults. To help implement the various educational programs, psychologists, anthropologists, and linguists were added to the Bureau staff. It is no exaggeration to state that the accent during the 1930's and early 1940's was on *quality* in Indian education. Recognizing that Indians could not be assimilated without great trauma, if assimilated at all, through the harsh "get 'em off the reservation" system of the preceding half century, the Bureau's educational staff turned its attention to motivating youngsters to want to learn English, instead of throwing them into situations where they were *forced* to do so. An attempt was made to teach the children about their own history and culture at the same time they were learning about the history and culture of their white neighbors. The Indian languages, which were forbidden in the earlier boarding schools, were in some cases put to use in bilingual readers at this time.

Unfortunately, just as the Bureau was getting started with the new emphasis, World War II broke out. Linguists employed by the Bureau were inducted into the Armed Forces, and many teachers also left for military service. Some of the momentum accumulated during the 1930's was carried on in curriculum, teaching methods, and teacher preparation, but most of the force which made the experiment of the Depression years one of the most exciting events in the whole history of American education was lost.

In the immediate postwar years, the education program continued to suffer as the Bureau's appropriations were drastically cut. Within a short time, however, the demand for more Indian schools rose to a high pitch as Indian veterans who had returned to the reservation refused to be satisfied with the dearth of educational opportunities for themselves and their offspring. The result was a crash program of school construction in which the Indian Bureau has been engaged now for over ten years.

According to the 1960 census, there are slightly more than half a million persons in this country who identify themselves as Indians. Statistics compiled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs show that over 300,000 American Indians now live on or near reservations. These reservations differ greatly, one from the other, in terms of both size and the quality of their resources. They vary, for example, from tiny colonies in Nevada and rancherias in California—often with fewer than fifty acres of tribal land—to the gigantic Navajo Reservation, parts of which lie in three states, and which has more than twelve million tribally owned acres. Some reservations (unfortunately a minority) have extensive mineral deposits, fertile farming and grazing land, rich forests, and abundant supplies of fish and game. Others have acreages which, while sometimes extensive, are useless except for homesites, and to live on them often means being isolated from centers of education and employment. In fact, the physical isolation of a large part of the reservation population is one of the most critical factors in devising a program of education for Indian youngsters. Of all the non-English-speaking minorities in the United States—

not excepting the Spanish speakers of the Southwest—the American Indian is the one most frequently living in physical isolation from the rest of our society.

In addition to problems of poverty and isolation, the American Indian is inhibited in his acculturation by the fact that, if he lives on a reservation, he is likely to employ some language other than English for communication with the members of his family and with his Indian peers. Around 100 distinct dialects of surviving Indian languages are still being spoken in the United States today. Those of you who have lived or worked in Indian areas probably know the prestige value which speaking the tribal language has for American Indians. One of the most damaging indictments of an individual aspiring to the leadership of an Indian group is to have it known that he is unable to communicate effectively in the language of his tribe.

Although traditionally Indians have received their education in special federal schools, a majority are today enrolled in local public school districts many of which are wholly or partially supported by a federal subsidy. The Indian Bureau at present operates 264 schools scattered all the way from Point Barrow, Alaska, to the Everglades of southern Florida. The cost of operating these schools is often very high because they tend to be located in extremely isolated areas. For example, we have several dozen schools in Alaska which can be reached only by ship or plane, and in order to carry equipment and supplies to these locations we operate our own diesel ship—the *North Star*— a vessel of more than 10,000 tons. The nearly 50,000 youngsters enrolled in our schools are the most isolated and unacculturated of all the American Indian children. Almost all come from reservation homes where the median number of years of completed schooling for the adult population is less than eight nearly everywhere (one of the lowest among minority groups in the country). The young people who come from reservation homes, more likely than not, are totally unfamiliar with such concepts as business management, credit, banking, insurance, the structure of local, state, and national government, and good sanitation and health practices. Traditional ceremonies and Indian values provide strong motivations in their lives. Many come from homes where the head of the family has never worked at a steady job. In the Bureau's attempt to teach them English, whether as a first or second language, these social, economic, and cultural factors are of the most crucial significance.

On the basis of what I have said up to this point, it is easy to propound a question, to wit: why, since the Federal Government with the aid of other public and private agencies has been in the Indian education business for so long, are Indians today so undereducated? The answer, as is usually the case, is much less simple to arrive at than the question. However, a part of the answer lies in the attitude of the Indians themselves. For example, although Navajo leaders insisted that their treaty of 1868 contain provision for educating their children, the rank and file of the large Navajo population did not become interested in formal schooling until after World War II. The Federal Government in the intervening period has made an almost desperate attempt to *keep up* with the rate of Navajo population increase, which is one of the highest on earth. In this regard, we are not out of the woods yet.

The last of the Indian tribes to decide that academic life was for them was the Miccosukee of Florida, who for generations have isolated themselves deep in the Everglades of Florida. Just two years ago, they finally requested a school and got it. Nearly fifty beginners, ranging in age from six to sixteen, enrolled in the first classes. Few of these youngsters spoke any English.

Another reason why Indians are undereducated today is the fact that the Indian Bureau until the early 1950's never obtained the appropriations it needed to build schools in the more isolated areas, and public schools could not begin to assume the burden. Furthermore, even when off-reservation boarding schools were available, Indian parents often showed little enthusiasm for having their children taken away from them during the better part of every year and did not encourage their children to enroll.

At least one additional reason might be advanced to account for the undereducation of Indian youngsters today. That one has to do with the quality of the education which has been available to them. For the most part, until fairly recently, Indians have attended the special schools which have been maintained for their benefit by the Federal Government. As I have indicated, these have been widely scattered and have served tribes whose members speak more than a hundred different Indian dialects. During the boarding school era, the accent was on teaching Indians through a kind of denuding and reclothing process. First, one stripped off that which was Indian, and then he attempted to replace it with that which was white. However, the new raiment of the educated Indian was not always appreciated, nor was it always useful, when he returned to his reservation home. After the publication of the Merriam Report in 1928, the emphasis shifted to one of educating the Indian in his own environment, teaching him the things which were useful in that environment. What the eventual results of such a program would have been we cannot say for sure, but we do know that the Indians appeared to like it better that way and made more of an effort to take advantage of what was offered.

In the period since World War II, Indian education has, frankly, been a kind of hodge-podge, with federal day and boarding schools, mission schools, and, increasingly, public schools being in the picture. In line with the operations of the Bureau generally, the Bureau's education system has become highly decentralized. As a result, new techniques and methods, including those related to the teaching of English, have not always been diffused outside the areas of their discovery.

Since this conference is directed toward teaching English as a second language, I would like now to review some of the past and present procedures of the Bureau in this area. In our earliest schools, we used an approach which was relatively simple, or at least it seemed so. Indian youngsters were forbidden to speak their tribal languages, both in the classroom and out. This approach undermined the values of the Indian cultural systems and destroyed Indian pride.

The Merriam Report recommended a reversal of policy—in fact, a 180 degree turn in the educational approach. It recommended an approach built on the understanding of Indian life and a respect for Indian values. It recommended that the school program be designed to build on Indian foundations—not to destroy them—to make English an addition to, not a replacement for, the Indian tongue.

The Bureau took the recommendations seriously—and in the 1930's overhauled its staff by adding outstanding educators, linguists, and social scientists. A good start was made in preparing materials to give teachers a better understanding of Indian life. The Indian craft series, some Indian histories, and several bilingual readers were published by the Bureau. Inservice training sessions for staff members, especially for teachers, were instituted to bring about more understanding of the Indians and a different point of view. But, as I have indicated, just as the Bureau was getting well started, World War II broke out, and a good deal of the progress achieved during the 1930's was halted. Since the end of the war, relatively little in comparison with the prewar era has been accomplished.

Commissioner Nash, since he took office, has manifested a personal interest in the assessment of our English language teaching. A year ago he called in two of our linguists, an anthropologist, and two educators from teacher training institutions to sit down with us to study our situation. That assessment has revealed both strengths and weaknesses. What we have found shows that we are fairly successful with English teaching at the primary levels, less successful at the intermediate levels, and least successful at the high school levels. Studies consistently show that we begin to lose our Indian children at about the fourth grade, with the achievement gap growing wider as they move up the grade levels. I think we would all agree that the way we teach English must have much to do with this lack of achievement as learning becomes more abstract.

Tom Hopkins of our education staff recently compared our BIA approaches to English language teaching with the approaches recommended by the linguists. His report, which is available, shows that the Bureau subscribes to and attempts to apply the principles of language teaching which are generally recommended by the linguists. For example, we begin with oral English at all levels—with young children, with adolescents, and with adults. The learner is taught to hear and distinguish English sounds and to reproduce them in English speech patterns before he reads or writes the patterns. We find that the better the teachers understand the need for oral, before written, language, and the more consistently they apply the approach, the better the results. We give attention to association of meaning with English expression. Vocabulary load is controlled and presented in sentence patterns and the learner at all levels is drilled on expressing himself in English sentence patterns. Furthermore, English is not taught to replace the Indian tongue—Indians are encouraged to retain their Indian language and to use it. Additionally, I should add, we adjust our methods to the age of the learner.

With young children of preschool and primary levels, we teach English much in the same fashion as they learned their first language—by associating English expressions with their activities and play. Repetition is necessary to fix English expression, but at this age we believe that the repetition that produces the most lasting results is repetition of situations that call for use of the English expression introduced. We have found that the best motivation for English language learning at this younger age is a stimulating classroom environment which interests children in seeing, feeling, tasting, hearing, and doing—and a teacher who understands how to manipulate this environment to stimulate communication in the English expressions she wants the children to learn. We set aside a year to develop an oral English base—before we introduce reading with these beginners.

To a limited degree, our bilingual reading materials can be used to strengthen the teaching of reading. Unfortunately, though, our bilingual readers are limited to Sioux, Navajo, Hopi, and Spanish—and Indians speak many other languages.

In the special Navajo program developed in the 1940's, team teaching was tried with good results. An English-speaking teacher was paired with a Navajo instructional aide who had fluent command of both languages. The teacher and his instructional aide carefully planned the classroom program, with the home economics and shop teachers as additional members of the planning and teaching teams. These four persons decided the new concepts that would be developed and the English expressions that would be taught in relation to these concepts. The instructional aide developed the new concepts fully in Navajo, which did not limit intellectual growth to the learning of English. The individual learned new ideas at his own rate through his own language. The English-speaking teachers developed English as rapidly as each individual could master it, but the two processes were separate. The Navajo-speaking member of the team tested comprehension of English through Navajo, but most of the acquisition of new learning was through oral Navajo for the first three years. For most students, by the end of the third year, instruction could be switched to English with Navajo used to check the effectiveness of the learning. This program has been reported in the book, *Doorway Toward the Light*. The result of this program, aimed at salvaging teenage Navajos from complete illiteracy and giving them employable skills, has proven itself. Last summer, we located eighty-three members of the first graduating class of 1951 and found only three to be unemployed.

Let's now turn for a moment to our high school programs. Here, I believe, we are falling short of what is needed. Our dropout rate, although we are reducing it, is too high. Our high school youth have varying degrees of command of English, but many fall far short in this respect.

In the area of adult education, at least 24,000 Indians have expressed an interest in our programs. Some have a command of English, but most of them do not. They are increasingly being required to deal with ideas related to economic development, leasing, timber management, fiscal matters, and the like; and their lack of English, or limited command of English, is a roadblock to their understanding. We have struggled with the problem, but we have found no easy answers to uplift the literacy level of the total group.

I've sketched for you the setting for our language teaching problems, our approaches, and outlined for you how we handle the teaching of English at different age levels—young beginners, adolescent beginners, high school, and adults. In the final analysis, the Indian population provides American educators interested in language teaching with their best and most accessible laboratory. No other ethnic group in the United States is made up of persons who employ such a variety of languages for daily communication. If we can meet the challenge of teaching English to Indian children, we can meet similar challenges anywhere else in the world.

The Puerto Rican Experience in English as a Second Language

Ralph B. Long

Extensive teaching of English in Puerto Rico began when the United States came in. Puerto Ricans were not made United States citizens until 1917, but from the beginning of United States involvement it was assumed that they wanted to learn English and ought to learn it. A tremendous amount of thought, work, and money went into the teaching of English, so that in 1939 Professor Algernon Coleman felt justified in writing that the teaching of English had absorbed "most of the financial resources of the school system of Puerto Rico" during the preceding forty years.

The history of English teaching in Puerto Rico since 1898 is quite complex. An excellent account of the first half century of it is to be found in Robert Herndon Fife and Herschel T. Manuel's *The Teaching of English in Puerto Rico* (1951). By 1947 a number of troublesome questions had been settled—not permanently, of course, since educational and political settlements are never really permanent, but at least for the period in which we are now living. The year 1947 is significant in Puerto Rican education not because it ended a half century of United States involvement but because it was the year in which the island achieved control of its educational system.

It had been settled by 1947 that Spanish was to remain the basic language of the island, was to be taught thoroughly, and was to be the normal medium of instruction in public educational institutions at all levels. Actually there had never been any real threat to the position of Spanish as the language of everyday life on the island. The policy of the first Commissioner of Education, in office from 1900 to 1902, has been the accepted one throughout this century: to work for "the conservation of Spanish and the acquisition of English."

Spanish has been vigorously taught in Puerto Rico. In 1898 it was estimated that only 20 percent of the population was literate; the 1940 census showed 68 percent of the population able to read and write Spanish; and the 1960 census, 83 percent. By 1947 the Department of Hispanic Studies had become one of the most important divisions within the rapidly expanding University of Puerto Rico. In theory, English was the language of instruction even in the lower grades from 1905 to 1916; it was the language of instruction in the high schools during most of the half century that ended in 1947. The purpose of requiring that teaching be done in English was the basically laudable one of giving new generations of Puerto Ricans practice in the use of English for genuine and important communication, but the requirement proved unrealistic and was sometimes said to be handicapping the intellectual development of Puerto Rican children. By 1947, even at the university level, Spanish was recognized as the usual language of instruction in public educational institutions in Puerto Rico.

It was clear by 1947 that general bilingualism is not a present possibility in Puerto Rico. Whole populations simply cannot become bilingual on demand. Where whole populations can hear and speak two languages efficiently and comfortably—as apparently the people of Paraguay can, to choose an example recently discussed in *Americas* (1964) by Professor Rubén Bareiro Saguier—circumstances have inevitably been much more favorable to bilingualism than they have been in Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico, though written English is widespread (especially in the schools, where beginning in the upper grades textbooks are largely in English, and in stores), English is not the language of everyday life for the great majority of the population. But as an exceptionally useful second language, English, spoken as well as written, is clearly gaining ground. The 1920 census showed approximately 10 percent of the Puerto Rican population ten years old and older able to speak English; the 1940 census showed approximately 28 percent; the 1960 census, approximately 38 percent. It is never possible to accept such figures uncritically; nevertheless it is not possible to brush them aside either. They confirm what we already know. English has gained considerable ground in Puerto Rico—and not at the expense of Spanish—but most Puerto Ricans are not really bilingual.

It was clear by 1947 that the teaching of English in Puerto Rico was to be done in the main by Puerto Ricans. Earlier in the century considerable numbers of teachers from the continent had been brought in; but salaries were generally low, adjustment was often difficult, and Puerto Rican teachers sometimes resented the situations that resulted. Teachers from the continent can still be found in the public schools, but not commonly. The pay is low and the work is hard. For this reason, at the University of Puerto Rico, the most promising students, from the point of view either of total academic record or of mastery of English, commonly find other kinds of work more attractive. In the lower grades, English is taught by the regular teachers, like other subjects. I myself have taught a considerable number of elementary education majors in a special course in English they take at the University of Puerto Rico, and I usually have found them to be warmhearted people who are well suited by temperament for work with small children, but who simply lack the mastery of English that teachers of English should have—and, still worse, tend to be afraid of the language. The situation is better in the upper grades and in high school, where English is taught by teachers who have specialized in it; but it is difficult to overcome the bad start made in the lower grades. We are training more and more university students who are perfectly bilingual—most of them as a result of childhood residence on the continent or of training in the private schools of the island—and when such people major in English and make good records in their courses, they become exceptionally attractive candidates for positions in teaching English. At present not enough of them major in English.

It was clear by 1947 that in Puerto Rico the teaching of English was to begin in the first grade and continue into the university level. There are strong arguments against beginning as early as the first grade. Obviously the problem of providing competent teachers of English would be reduced in complexity if no English were taught in the lower grades, where the problem is most serious. With 42 percent of the elementary school children going to school only three hours a day in the fall of 1963, and another 21 percent going to school not more than five hours, time now given to English in the lower grades could be used to advantage in other subjects. Yet because, for both political reasons and pedagogical ones, there is strong support for starting spoken English in the first grade, this is what is done. So we have a great deal of English teaching going on in Puerto Rico. In the public schools, English gets between 40 and 60 minutes a day in the first six grades, between 75 and 100 minutes in the next three, and 50 minutes in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth. Our colleges and universities require further courses in English; at the University of Puerto Rico the general requirement is twelve semester hours, given at a variety of levels, and the College of Business Administration requires still more.

If it is true that by 1947 the general conditions under which English was to be taught in Puerto Rico had been rather clearly decided, it is also true that specific matters of content and procedure have remained subject to study and change. There has been a constant bringing in, for periods of varying length, of scholars whose work has seemed pertinent to the problems of teaching English on the island: for example, such linguists as Professors Charles C. Fries, Harold Whitehall, Dwight Bolinger, and Noam Chomsky.

An extensive study of English teaching in Puerto Rico made at the end of the fifties is reported on in one section of the three-volume *Estudio del Sistema Educativo de Puerto Rico* (1960), published under the editorship of Professor Ismael Rodríguez Bou. As early as 1916 Professor José Padín, later Commissioner of Education, had insisted that English should not be taught where it is a second language as it is taught where it is the home language; he had called for drill on matters that offer special difficulty because of structural differences between English and Spanish; and Professor Michael West had been brought to the island in the thirties to make recommendations on the basis of his pioneer work in English as a second language in India. An English Institute, established in 1944 under the direction of Professor Lewis C. Richardson, during the next five years did needed work on vocabulary and reading.

Textbook materials on a considerable scale have been produced since the forties both at the universities and at the insular Department of Education. The most widely known product of the strong Puerto Rican interest in the making of materials is of course the *Fries American English Series*, produced under the direction of Professor Pauline Rojas. For more than a decade now the *Fries Series* has shaped English training in the public schools of Puerto Rico. Considerable use is made of language laboratory techniques at the university level, and of television at varied levels. A television program for children in the lower grades has been developed in recent years under the direction of Professor Sylvia Viera.

We maintain a reading clinic. Some of our people are now interested in developing programed materials for use in first- and second-year university courses with students to whom pattern practice, as carried on in the grade schools and high schools of the island, has simply not taught extremely elementary matters of English structure. Under the direction of Professor Adela Méndez, the English Section of the insular Department of Education is now embarking on a frankly experimental approach to problems of materials and procedures in the grade schools and high schools.

The past two decades have seen an important development of another kind also. The private schools have been booming. About 10 percent of the grade school and high school enrollment on the island is now in private schools. Unlike the public schools, the private schools are staffed to a considerable extent by teachers and administrators from the continent; they teach to a very considerable extent in English. One of the surprising circumstances of life in Puerto Rico at the present time is the extent to which the Roman Catholic Church makes use of both teachers and clergy from the English-speaking continent.

A significant very recent development is the establishment of a graduate program in English at the University of Puerto Rico in 1964. Until quite recently the prevailing view among those responsible for the teaching of English in Puerto Rico was that graduate work in the field should be done on the continent, in an English-speaking environment. Several circumstances have united to undermine this opinion. First, many of our graduates have not really lived in English-speaking environments as graduate students on the continent; they have lived among other Spanish-speaking students and have not talked English much more than is easily possible in Puerto Rico. Second, entirely too many of our people have taken graduate programs in English as a second language that have gone over ground already covered rather thoroughly in advanced undergraduate courses in Puerto Rico. Third, many of our English majors have already lived in the States. And finally, our own staff needs the stimulus and opportunity supplied by involvement in graduate teaching. Two master's programs in English are now available at the University of Puerto Rico: one under the sponsorship of the College of Education, the other in the College of Humanities.

In 1964, then, an enormous amount of work in English as a second language is being carried on in Puerto Rico. In the public elementary schools, about 6,000 teachers have

English as one of the subjects they teach; in the public elementary schools and high schools together about 1,800 teachers have English as the only subject they teach; on the Rio Piedras campus of the University of Puerto Rico, there are 103 teachers of university level English this semester including five teachers of education courses in the teaching of English. Other university level institutions and campuses on the island seem to have a total of 93 teachers of English all told, and of course there are a good many teachers of English in the private elementary schools and high schools. A great deal of experience has been accumulated, and materials of many kinds have been developed. There has been—and, especially if we take the private institutions into account, there still is—considerable variety in both materials and procedures.

I do not know where else in this hemisphere so great an accumulation of experience can be found or so much interest in new developments in the field. Both teaching and research in English as a second language can be done in Puerto Rico under uniquely favorable conditions. Puerto Rico would seem to be without equal in this hemisphere in its potentialities as a place to train teachers of English as a second language, especially for Spanish-speaking areas. Professor Joseph Kavetsky is entirely justified in writing, in the Puerto Rican English newsletter *Pret* (1964), that it is deplorable that so little attention is given on the continent to the Puerto Rican experience in English as a second language.

But we still have problems with English teaching in Puerto Rico, after sixty-six years of hard work with it. And we need help. Since our needs are doubtless confronted in programs in English as a second language elsewhere, a brief listing of them seems desirable here. Obviously I speak only for myself when I make such a list: I am sure lists made by many of my colleagues would be much like mine, but perhaps none would be wholly like it.

I would say, first of all, that we need to know more about the psychology of learning a second language. We are living in a world in which differences in race, religion, and language produce tragic divisions in places as unlike as Mississippi and Quebec on the North American continent and Belgium and Yugoslavia in Europe, to look no further. Differences in language are more genuinely divisive in their nature than differences in race and religion, and of course they are often accompanied by troublesome differences in ways of life and standards of living. English arouses antagonism in much of the world; a conspicuous example of this is the recent French best-seller *Parlez-vous Franglais?* written by a professor of comparative literature at the University of Paris, in which it is said that American imperialism is trying to destroy the French language in order to make a colony of France. In Puerto Rico, too, occasionally the fear is expressed that English may replace Spanish on the island in time; more often, the fear is that English will contaminate the Spanish of the island and make it an inferior instrument. Occasionally, too, fear that bilingualism is emotionally and/or intellectually damaging finds expression. These are delicate matters; they should not be ignored, and they must not be dealt with ignorantly or insensitively. We need the benefit of studies of the kind such men as Professor Wallace Lambert have been making.

In constructing materials, we need to pay more attention to interest and appropriateness of content and a little less, I would say, to limitation of vocabulary, which has gone entirely too far, and manipulation of selected structures. Obviously we must work with children wherever we possibly can. It should be very easy to interest children and get them to the point where they hear and speak comfortably. Is it visionary to think that in the second half of the twentieth century motion pictures and television can be of very great help in teaching languages to children? Long series of short films telling simple stories, with child actors the age of the listening children, and with English very, very simple at the beginning, should be able to get children into the spoken language easily and effectively, and with good pronunciation.

Reading material too should be interesting above all. Personally I would like to see it include truthful accounts of what life is like in such places as Vermont, South Carolina, Iowa, New Mexico, Alaska, and Hawaii, and in such other places as England, Wales, Jamaica, South Africa, and Australia. In the construction both of film series and of readers, what is needed most of all is the kind of artistry that goes into the making of good children's books. Linguists should be consulted but should not be listened to with too much respect. It would seem wise to make both films and readers for all Hispanic America, not just for Puerto Rico; the very considerable initial expense of quality materials could be spread quite thin on such a basis. We have good people working both on television programs and on readers in Puerto Rico, but they should not be working in isolation.

We need greater intellectual content in the materials used in English as a second language above the elementary grades. Students should learn a good deal about the English language. Attention to vocabulary has been unfashionable in the past two decades, but the English vocabulary deserves attention.

But English spelling and the sound system of the commonest type of American English should be taught systematically. And personally, I think students of English as a second language—or of English as the first language, for that matter—should be taught systematic grammar little by little. When there is pattern practice, it should be accompanied by explanation. Professor Vincenzo Cioffari was right when he wrote, in the *Modern Language Journal* (1962), that "a student who reproduces pattern drills perfectly, but without comprehension, is no better off than the student who reproduces paradigms or grammar rules." Professor Leon Livingston was right when he wrote, in the same issue of the *Modern Language Journal*, that all pattern drills "require grammatical comment to be fully understood," and it is pointless to "play hide-and-seek" with students who have achieved "what Rousseau called the age of reason." Professor Theodore Huebener has written more recently, in the *Modern Language Journal* (1963), that in the New York schools grammatical description has recently been reintroduced into second-language courses because it has been found that bright students are unwilling simply to repeat structures but want explanations. Professor Huebener's paper has the significant title "The New Key Is Now Off-Key!"

In his *Language and Language Learning* (1960), Professor Nelson Brooks says that advanced students of a second language should have available at all times "a comprehensive presentation of the standard patterns of the linguistic structure of the new language." This, I believe, is true—and I would say that one of the things we need, in English as a second language, is usable handbooks of English grammar. I would say that any program in English as a second language that extends over more than two or three years—and for Puerto Rican students who go to college the ordinary program extends through fourteen years—should include a great deal of composition in English. Finally, I would say, as Professor Pauline Rojas said at the 1957 Conference on Linguistics and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (reported on in *Language Learning* in 1958), that when students have learned to use English approximately as native speakers do, they can be dealt with about as students who are native speakers are dealt with. Successful programs in a truly distinct English as a second language will never require course after course and course after course.

In English as a second language we are dealing with a complex set of problems, and it is clear that our solutions too must be complex. No single mystique can save us, and no single technique can be adequate. However, long our experience in the field may have been, in Puerto Rico or elsewhere, it is right that all of us who work in it should feel that much more remains to be done. And it is right that we should not want to work in isolation.

Remedial English for Students from Spanish-Speaking Homes

Marjorie C. Streiff

At Wakefield Junior High School, a group of eighth graders have been subjects of a pilot study to determine if various linguistic theories and techniques, as well as theories concerning the culturally disadvantaged, could be applied in teaching remedial English to intermediate students from Spanish-speaking homes. This group was selected on the basis of sixth grade teachers' subjective evaluations of greater mental ability than cumulative score records indicated. Our premise was that these "retarded" students were capable of average or above-average work if provided with sufficient motivation and the necessary language skills.

In this situation we think that the problems confronting the teacher differ considerably from those most commonly encountered in second-language teaching. Many of these students have attended English-speaking schools for several years, but it can be generalized that within this group appeared almost every type of language disorder that might be expected from a premature initiation into the written forms of a language before its elementary spoken forms were mastered.

While it can be argued that many students have learned a second language through reading and translation, there is a major difference in that a foundation in the symbol-sound correspondences in the mother tongue was laid first. The Spanish-speaking student with whom we are concerned lacks this foundation, for he does not read or write his native tongue, nor has he received any formal instruction in the way it functions. In his early experiences he was forced to work almost exclusively with the written symbols of a language whose sound system and structure were unfamiliar to him. By the time he reaches the intermediate grade levels, he may still show evidences of lacking reference in either Spanish or English to the relationship between symbol and sound.

In our situation we have found that linguistic analysis provides some vital insights into the specific nature of the problems encountered by this student, but that corrective measures are not as simple as might be supposed. These students use an English language, and regardless of how inadequate it may be adjudged in the classroom, many are satisfied with it. Lack of environmental experiences may inhibit communication generally. Social and cultural values, as well as family and peer group pressures, may provide little motivation for mastery of English or whatever may be communicated through it in the classroom.

In addition, at this level the teacher may be tampering with a language learned the hard way—a reconciliatory means of communication the student has developed on his own to serve him in a potentially difficult transition area where school and home may come into conflict. Not only are old and deeply ingrained habits of faulty pronunciation and usage difficult to overcome, but the teacher may have to cope with the individual student's problems which may result from years of confusion, apathy, habitual and well-practiced nonlistening as well as negative attitudes towards self and school. Because students are conditioned to think that education is derived for the most part from the printed word, we have experienced active resistance towards instructional methods which deprive them of the relative security afforded by prestructured classroom materials such as workbook exercises, objective tests, etc.

We believe that the most glaring deficiency of these students is their inability to function effectively in extemporaneous language situations. While there is a wide range of vocabulary comprehension within this group, there is a general inability to use the words they comprehend in original expression. In order to build the student's confidence in the language itself, as well as in his own ability, we are trying to help him use what he already knows in appropriate constructions. We are in the process of developing and evaluating materials by which we can present the sound and syntactical system of English as quickly and efficiently as possible. Because structural linguistics provides a clear and concise picture of the language through patterns, because the students respond well to lessons based on structural models, and because models require them to do their own work, we are trying to combine audiolingual and audiovisual techniques with inductively learned "grammar." We have made changes we deemed necessary in order that the student may continue in a regular curriculum with minimal difficulties.

Reading has been deemphasized until the student is quite proficient in working with the noun, verb, and modification structures. We are operating on the assumption, and it may be a precarious one, that if the segmental sound patterns are mastered—if the student can immediately recognize thought units—the reading will take care of itself. Reading materials which would support and supplement what we are attempting in the classroom would be of great benefit, but we have been unable to find them. It is our hope to develop student-prepared reading materials.

In addition to the syntactical system, we work with other elements of English, stressing the areas of difficulty caused by differences between Spanish and English. The sequence of instruction for this group began in the seventh grade with speech instruction. Although it was not our original intention to teach IPA, the students reported it so helpful that we have incorporated it as an integral part of the program. We have found that our students like to learn about the speech mechanism and how it functions.

To further emphasize the systematic nature of English, we teach spelling through basic spelling patterns and regular representations of symbol for sound. We pay special heed to final consonant blends which do not occur in Spanish, including bound morphemes such as the third person singular "s" and "ed" endings.

We work on intonation at all times, especially juncture, because it opens the door to punctuation. Any classroom or playground experience may provide opportunity to demonstrate the importance of intonation in meaning.

To teach idioms and slang, we use a "mud-on-the-wall" approach. Jokes, cartoons, board lists with Spanish translations, student collections, newspaper headlines, etc., provide ample examples.

A technique we have found particularly successful is to lead the student to use the vocabulary words he already knows in manipulative exercises utilizing systematic, controlled syntactical constructions. From a kernel sentence he is taught to generate as many sentences as his vocabulary and intuition will allow. Selective word lists to fill a designated slot may be provided if the student is very deficient in his ability to determine what is or isn't grammatical.

For this type of exercise we use pictures depicting various scenes of American life to broaden the experiential background and to provide a meaningful communication situation.

A "brainstorming" slot-filler technique is used for involvement and to accustom these students to hearing and using words they may otherwise avoid in a peer group situation. Under normal circumstances the vocabulary progresses from concrete to abstract ideas. We use test frames to reinforce knowledge about the form classes (for which we use the traditional "noun," "verb," "adjective," and "adverb").

The goal is to use structures of modification with ease on the theory that reading comprehension and writing skills are largely dependent upon immediate recognition and recall of these structures. We stress the fact that modification is a fluent and efficient method of joining ideas.

Because most of these students report great difficulty in articulating main ideas or generalizations or in locating them in textbooks used in other subject areas, the partial structures are combined into expressions of general relationships based on basic sentence patterns. Special effort is made to relate ideas to other subject matter areas.

The underlying purpose of this type of lesson is to encourage the student to manipulate the language to express *his* ideas. The pattern approach may be a more rigid, less creative method than is desirable under other circumstances. We think that through this type of systematic instruction, which allows the student to use his own vocabulary and exposes him to new words simultaneously, yet which minimizes the possibility of error, we will make the most gains in the long run.

The usual culminating activity is to write a composition on any subject which the activity may inspire. The students are encouraged to use the new vocabulary and the new structure several times to reinforce the learning. Any medium of expression may be used: humor, anger, opinion, story, etc.

The differences between spoken and written language are stressed at all times. We encourage the students to use the language as their native English-speaking peers use it in conversation, and we point out that some usages will get them in the front door and others in the back door.

This type of program is essentially a salvage operation. It is the considered opinion of the teachers working in this experimental situation that the seventh grade is too late for this type of instruction. Too many valuable hours of these students' lives have been wasted. We believe that if effective means of teaching English were introduced at the primary level, if remedial language and speech programs were substituted for some of the remedial reading programs in the elementary schools, if teachers at all levels were more adequately trained in linguistic methods and techniques, programs of this sort would be unnecessary.

Helping Elementary School Children Learn English as a Second Language—An Inservice Training Program

Duke Saunders

"I have four children in my class who don't understand English! What can I do?"

For years this has been a typical question of many teachers in the Los Angeles City Schools. Part of our non-English-speaking population are recent arrivals from Mexico. Another portion consists of Mexican Americans who can function effectively for twenty-four hours a day using the Spanish language in our Eastside. The problems are further reinforced by conditions typical to any large urban area—in-migration, different cultures, mobility of population, housing conditions, and low economic levels.

In light of the situation the Los Angeles City Board of Education initiated a program of action. One phase of the program was the establishment of "The Compensatory Education Program in the Elementary Schools." It involves the assignment of one or two extra teachers in selected schools: (1) to reduce pupil-teacher ratio in the primary grades, (2) to establish classes to teach English to non-English-speaking children, and (3) to provide remedial reading classes. A second provision of the program is "The Extended School Day Program" to supplement the regular school program in ways that will increase the opportunities for these children to succeed in school. Some of the activities include these: learning oral English, studying the culture of Mexico, leadership activities, and cultural enrichment through the use of field trips, speakers, musical programs, and art exhibits.

To implement successfully the aforementioned programs and to meet the ever increasing language problems in our schools, it was necessary to provide inservice training for teachers and principals. An inservice training class was established in teaching English as a second language. Thirty-five teachers participated in eight two-hour sessions, directed by Dr. Martha Brockman of San Fernando Valley State College. Course content included: How Language Is Learned; The Sound System; Patterns of Organization; Word Meanings; Problems of Spanish Speakers Learning English; and Methods of Language Teaching. A representative collection of the standard books in the field was used as resource material.

It was felt that to augment the technical phase of teaching these children, it was necessary to understand them better. A morning workshop for our seventy-five principals, on Understanding the Culture of Mexican Americans, was conducted by Dr. and Mrs. Paul Sheldon of the Laboratory of Urban Culture, Occidental College. Because, as an outcome of this workshop, thirty principals expressed a desire to pursue the subject in depth, an eight-meeting inservice class was organized. This was followed by another class given for teachers of our special programs and others who were interested. The content of these classes included: The Mexican American in the United States; Basic Sociological and Psychological Concepts; Urbanism and Urban Problems; The History of Mexico and Mexican Americans; Contrasts between Mexican Rural "Folk" and Anglo-Urban Cultures; Leadership and Organizations in the Mexican American Community; The Middle Class Teacher in the Mexican American School; and Implications for the Schools. The reactions to these classes both by school people and community leaders has been outstanding.

Because of a lack of classroom teaching materials available, the teachers who originally participated in the classes in linguistics are continuing to participate in a workshop to construct teaching aids. They have developed pictures, sound tapes, object kits, and unit plans that can be used in the classroom.

Another phase of the inservice program includes classes in conversational Spanish for teachers. Two teachers of Spanish from our secondary schools were recruited as leaders of this part of the program. Again, reaction is very positive.

An indirect part of our inservice training might better be termed "infamily training." Our adult school program for teaching English as a second language has been expanded to include classes in the local elementary schools for the parent. It is hoped that this also will help our boys and girls learn English more rapidly.

After almost a year of the program's initiation, pupils, teachers, and principals were asked to evaluate. The teachers were unanimous in the opinion that the children exhibited a change of attitude that resulted in increased confidence and participation in classroom discussion. Regular classroom teachers indicated that the program has been needed for a long time and has been the most successful special class with which they have had experience. Pupils were especially supportive of classes for non-English-speaking pupils. The enthusiasm was evident on the part of these pupils, and all indicated great satisfaction with their success.

Looking toward the future to improve our program, we are attempting to be aware of our unmet needs. We need to look critically at the present curriculum. We need to adapt courses of study so that the interest, content, and objectives are better suited to varying groups of children. We feel there is a great need for the development of books and materials that are oriented to the local classroom. We need the services of experts in the field who are not too busy to devote time to us. We are thinking of using university graduate students to help in this area. Some preservice training on the part of teacher training institutions would be beneficial. More work with the preschool child has begun, but needs to be expanded and evaluated to take full advantage of the opportunities in this area. There is also a need for a more systematic sharing of information between school districts in this specialized field. Elementary school people need to become more interested and active so that their needs, experiences, and influence are reflected.

The future holds unlimited opportunities for experimentation and investigation. Present plans call for inservice classes in appreciation of the contributions of other cultures in the fields of art, music, and physical education. Present attempts are, at best, only token efforts.

We in Los Angeles City Schools do not feel that our inservice program should serve as a model or that we have the best program available. We say we're doing something and looking for ways of improving our present attempts. We are fighting time and numbers, but we think we're helping the problem disappear a little more quickly.

The Challenge in Teaching the Navajo

Beatrice T. Estrada

Gallup-McKinley County Schools have an enrollment of over 4,000 Indian students, including the Navajo and the Zuni. In nine schools the enrollment is largely Indian. Eight of these schools are in rural areas, one in Gallup.

A major step in meeting the challenge of teaching these Indian children was taken in August 1962 at the University of Arizona. A program was conceived by which a teacher trained in second-language techniques could coordinate a pilot program at one school. Tohatchi Public School was designated as the pilot school; I was appointed coordinator.

As plans developed, however, it was felt that the other schools with an identical problem could not afford to wait a year for help. Hence the program was expanded to provide for the distribution of the materials prepared and tested at the pilot school, and for the training of teachers in second language methods, as well as for teacher evaluation of the materials.

The format for the lessons was a revised form of lesson plans used at New Mexico Western in teaching student teachers. The lessons were written by the language coordinator at Tohatchi, then used in the prefirst grade where the coordinator taught the lessons twenty to thirty minutes twice daily in each prefirst classroom at Tohatchi. She presented the lesson and then left the classroom teacher to continue teaching the lesson for the remainder of the language drill time. The lessons were evaluated by the classroom teacher, revised as needed, and then duplicated for distribution to all prefirst grade teachers in the system.

Whereas at Tohatchi the language coordinator presented each lesson, at the other schools the prefirst classroom teacher conducted the entire program. The classroom teacher evaluated the materials as she used them in her classroom.

Each month all prefirst teachers met with the coordinator to discuss the lessons already taught. At these meetings the prefirst teachers were also given inservice training in second-language methods and techniques. The final meeting of the prefirst group was held in May 1963, at which time the consensus of opinion was that the program had been successful. The revised materials were put into permanent form for the next school year.

During the 1963–64 school year, the prefirst language materials have undergone final evaluation, and materials for the first grade have been prepared. Included in the program this past year was a traveling schedule for the coordinator. At the beginning of the year, these visits usually involved demonstration of second-language techniques.

This is how the Gallup-McKinley County Schools have attempted to meet the challenge of helping hundreds of little, middle-sized, and big people who speak a language other than English learn to speak English.

Something to Talk About—Language Learning Through Experience

Joyce Morris

Santo Domingo is the largest Keresan-speaking Pueblo in the Rio Grande Valley. It has long been known as one of the bastions of Indian tradition and language; therefore, many of the children come to school speaking very little English, or none at all, though this is not meant to imply resistance to education. The concern of Santo Domingo parents for the education of their children was demonstrated when the Pueblo requested that the new public school be constructed near Santo Domingo. The large, pueblo style building, completed seven years ago, now accommodates approximately 700 children in grades kindergarten through eight. The enrollment is almost entirely Indian.

Interest in teaching English as a second language is not a sudden development at Santo Domingo School. Mr. David Sanchez, Superintendent of the Bernalillo Public School System, has long encouraged his teachers to learn and use new ideas. Teachers have access to a wide variety of audiovisual devices and materials, including tape recorders and a portable language laboratory. A well-stocked Learning Materials Center, emphasizing language materials, is also available to all teachers within the Bernalillo system.

In keeping with this interest and willingness to try new ideas, Mr. Sanchez and the staff at Santo Domingo School agreed to participate in the pilot program now nearing completion.

The theoretical basis for this program is quite simple:

1) Lack of fluency in the English language is perhaps the greatest handicap to school success confronting Indian children in the Southwest.

2) For the reservation Indian child, lack of familiarity with the "world outside" makes it difficult to relate what he reads in his textbooks, or what his teacher tells him about, to *his* life and *his* needs.

The children involved in the Santo Domingo program are those in one first grade and two second grade classrooms—a total of eighty-five children. Since the beginning of the program's operation, in December 1962, these children have participated in a number of carefully planned excursions, designed to widen the children's range of real experience and to provide a stimulus to language learning.

In order to illustrate the general idea, I would like to tell you about just one unit. In October 1963, the children visited a dairy and a large bakery in Albuquerque. Numerous films had already been viewed and discussed, using the planned language patterns and vocabulary. The children talked to the workers in each plant, asking questions about the work going on, the distribution of their products, where the raw materials came from, how much the finished product cost, and so on. After the children returned to the classroom, the following activities were among those in progress in each classroom: thank you letters were being written, chart stories were being composed and read by the children, murals and individual trip booklets were being completed, maps showing wheat growing and dairy centers in the United States were being illustrated, and discussions were being carried on with great enthusiasm. Because the children decided they would like to try baking something of their own, a movie on baking bread was rerun so the children could get the recipe and watch the process again. This involved the need to learn to measure accurately and to be able to name and recognize ingredients, utensils, and units of measurement: half-a-cup, quarter of a pound, and a *level* tablespoon. The next step was a trip to the kitchen to inspect the large oven and to learn about gas, temperature, and how to control the baking. Remembering the workers at the bakery, the children wanted white aprons and caps, so a roll of white paper was provided and the children measured the amount needed to make their uniforms. In order to celebrate their accomplishment, the children invited the school principal and several other guests to share in the feast, which involved writing invitations, counting plates and cups, setting the tables, and practicing the language necessary to talk to guests and to tell them about their activities. This one trip provided the basis for numerous activities in social studies, science, arithmetic, writing, reading, art, and above all, oral language and more oral language.

Since the beginning of the program these children have participated in ten such trips, including visits to:

1) A large shopping center in Albuquerque, where the children met Santa Claus and rode real reindeer.
2 A soft drink bottling company.
3) A potato chip factory.
4) Top of the First National Bank Building in Albuquerque, where the children rode the elevator to the sixteenth floor for a view of the city.
5) Kirtland Air Force Base, where each child sat in the pilot's seat.
6) A dairy farm in Albuquerque.
7) The Shrine Circus.
8) The State Fair.
9) A bakery in Albuquerque.
10) A dairy.
11) An apple orchard near Santo Domingo.
12) Ortega's weaving shop in Chimayo.

What better way to embark on a program of second-language teaching than by stimulating the child's natural desire and need to name new things and express new ideas? This is, in essence, the idea behind the experience approach to language learning that is being tried at Santo Domingo. The child is placed in a new setting, exposed to new things and experiences, and then provided with the language needed to discuss them.

Linguistics and Language Teaching at the University of Hawaii

Donald I. Dickinson

Not so many years ago—because of the magnificent sun and surf—some people regarded the University of Hawaii as a place where one came to summer school to specialize in underwater basket weaving or the undulant forms of the hula. There is no longer any room for such an assertion. Students now often work harder in summer school than in the regular session. The "new look" at the university is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in the field of linguistics and language teaching. In addition to its substantial Peace Corps program, which is conducted off-campus at Hilo,[1] the university is engaged in several activities involving linguistics on the campus.

A. *European and Classical Languages; Asian and Pacific Languages*

Besides the traditional classical and European languages taught on almost every campus, the University of Hawaii lists such varied Asian and Pacific languages as Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Thai, Hindi, Indonesian, Javanese, Sanskrit, Tagalog—not to mention courses in elementary Hawaiian and Hawaiian traditional poetry. The Asian collection of the university contains a total of more than 150,000 volumes and 9,000 microfilm reels of Asian newspapers, rare books, and diplomatic correspondence. The library also subscribes to many Asian periodicals. Through individual donations and assistance from the East-West Center, the library is rapidly expanding, and its Asian microfilm collection will soon be one of the largest of any university library. A crash program has been inaugurated to preserve on microfilm important documents in the Pacific island areas. The Asian Studies program under the direction of Dr. Ronald Anderson organizes 200 courses into degree programs, strengthens staff and library holdings in Asian language and area programs.

The university has two NDEA language and area centers in the specific Asian languages: (1) Japanese, Chinese, and Korean, and (2) Indian, Javanese, and Thai.

Modern intensive language teaching including smaller classes, more aural/oral drill sections, and heavier lab practice requirements are now raising the effectiveness of language teaching in the older and more traditional departments as well as in the new.

B. *Linguistics Department*

In the spring of 1963 a Linguistics Department was established in the graduate school under the direction of Dr. Howard McKaughan, Chairman. Most recently at the University of Washington, Dr. McKaughan was trained at Cornell and, associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics, he has done extensive work in nonrecorded languages of the Southwest Pacific. He is presently working on a dictionary of Maranao, a Philippine dialect. Other principal staff members and their areas of specialization are Dr. Floyd Cammack—Malayo-Polynesian languages and linguistics; Dr. Albert W. Schutz—introductory analysis, field methods, South Pacific languages; Dr. George Grace—comparative and historical linguistics, Micronesian and New Guinea languages; Dr. Stan Tsuzaki—introductory analysis, phonemics, morphology, languages in contact; Dr. Samuel Elbert—Hawaiian and Malayo-Polynesian.

---

[1] Editor's Note: Professor Dickinson's account of the Peace Corps program at the University of Hawaii appears on p. 49.

Linguistics, other campus departments, and the East-West Center all have brought important visiting staff in linguistics to the University of Hawaii campus. Last semester, C. H. Voegelin, Chairman of Anthropology at Indiana, was working here on languages of the world. This fall Dr. Charles Osgood of Illinois will offer a seminar in psycholinguistics, and for 1965–66, Dr. Samuel Martin, Professor of Far Eastern Linguistics at Yale, will serve in various capacities in the University of Hawaii Linguistics Department.

The Linguistics Department already is playing a major role in establishing and directing research, in teaching basic courses in general linguistics and linguistic theory, in advising programs in applied linguistics, and in getting foundation research funds for special projects. One most interesting proposal for foundation funding is a Pacific Lexicography Center which would gather material important for production of multilanguage dictionaries, for historical comparisons of semantic systems, and for the improvement of lexicography techniques.

Since the Linguistics Department is a graduate department, it has pushed to establish advanced degree programs. The M.A. is now available. A Ph.D. program proposal has been submitted to the administration, and it is hoped that the degree program will be offered in academic year 1965-66. Courses from the base of Introduction to Linguistic Analysis to Area Linguistics (structures of languages of various areas of the world), and Ethno-Linguistics will be offered. Specific objectives for candidates in the Ph.D. program include research—such as the collection, analysis, and comparison of various Asian, Pacific, or other languages; training for careers in teaching of linguistics, or for supervision of government or other training programs; TESL; machine translation; and, finally, the relation of linguistics to other fields. One of the more interesting special projects proposed by the Linguistics Department is the establishment, through foundations, of a million-dollar Lexicography Center which would bring scholars together to work on practical dictionaries, studies in prehistory, and structural semantics.

C. *Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)*

Three major campus programs are concerned with the teaching of English as a second language.

English Language Institute is the largest of these TESL programs. Numbers of East-West Center grantees and other Asian and Pacific students at the university have in three years swollen the ELI enrollment from a yearly 70 to 100 students, to approximately 520 for this year. Students in the Institute represent 20 countries, mostly Asian and Pacific. Last August, ELI gave special English training to a group of Japanese Fulbright scholars going to mainland universities.

Administratively, the Institute is connected to the Linguistics Department. The instructional staff consists of native speakers of English trained in the teaching of English as a second language.

The beginning course is full-time and intensive for students who cannot yet successfully carry any regular academic load in the university. It meets 25 hours per week, including 5 hours of required laboratory. Intermediate and advanced courses feature more fluency drill, free conversation, reading and writing—and meet 12 and 3 hours per week, respectively.

Resources and special equipment include new equipment in a forty-place lab (students may repeat and hear themselves—as well as record their own voices on dual track tapes); our own extensive tape series; an English Language Reading Room of several hundred books and periodicals on linguistics, English language, and TESL; a battery of contrastive studies of native languages of foreign students enrolled in the Institute. Finally, there are new and supplemental materials prepared weekly for use in the classroom.

While we are pleased with student progress and morale, we are not satisfied that we have by any means achieved perfection in program and materials. To better evaluate our programs, (1) we have recently visited almost every ELI class taught at every level and have then discussed our evaluations with the individual instructors. (2) We have reviewed past test results and discarded some of the tests we were using in favor of—we hope—more accurate ones. (3) We are experimenting with a new oral interview scale. (4) We are preparing our own intermediate and advanced reading texts with appropriate linguistic drills. We hope to make better use of the lab at advanced levels for practice in listening to lectures, notetaking, vocabulary building, and general increase in fluency. (5) We are offering a reading development course and are trying to improve materials in this area.

By 1966 we should be in a completely new building where all the classrooms will be the right size for our operation and the latest audiovisual and laboratory equipment will be featured. ELI will then serve apprentice teachers in the TESL M.A. program, allowing an opportunity for observation and practice.

MATESL stands for M.A. program in teaching English as a second language. The most popular single graduate program for Asian students—particularly East-West Center grantees—the MATESL program is open to both foreign and native graduate students. It is a 36-credit-hour, nonthesis program with major emphasis on a basic foundation in linguistics and its application to teaching English. Native students are required to pursue competence in the language and culture of the area in which they intend to teach English. Foreign students are required to take a course in Introduction to Contemporary America. Dr. Stanley Tsuzaki of the Linguistics Department coordinates the program. Dr. Howard McKaughan is Graduate Faculty Chairman.

TIP, pronounced /tip/, means Teacher Interchange Program, an eleven-month, all-expense scholarship in Asian Studies for American high school teachers and for Asians specializing in American studies or English language and literature. For a time, both Asian and American teachers and curriculum coordinators live together and work together in seminars at the University of Hawaii. After the academic year in Hawaii, qualified American participants are given a summer's field experience in Japan, taking part in a "Workshop in International Education." Dr. Ronald Anderson is program coordinator.

The TIP program has much value for cultural interchange, for a marked contribution to understanding, and for development of new educational materials and techniques. Asian participants have opportunity to take advanced skills courses in the English Language Institute, as well as to observe teaching methods employed in the Institute. Because many of the Asians are top-notch teachers and curriculum coordinators, they should eventually be able to exert a broad and profound influence on English teaching and general education in their own countries.

Conclusion. What with East-West Center Translation Bureaus, visiting scholars working on Indonesian and Ryukuan dictionaries, and even the English Department applying linguistics to teaching (in its 1964 English Institute for selected high school teachers in Hawaii)—I have only scratched the surface of significant linguistic activity at the University of Hawaii. In summary, Hawaii, the University of Hawaii, and the East-West Center occupy a fortunate geographical and cultural position which affords remarkable resources for language study and practical application. This situation should steadily increase understanding of language and culture among all peoples of the Pacific Basin, and beyond.

English Teachers for Thailand: A Peace Corps Training Program

Edward M. Anthony

The University of Michigan has administered two training programs for Peace Corps volunteers destined for two-year assignments to Thailand, one during the period October 9, 1961, to January 18, 1962; the second from June 19 to September 7, 1962. Neither of these programs was devoted entirely to the preparation of English teachers, but both included English teacher training segments. Because we who have worked at the University of Michigan believe that our second program was a better program, most of what I have to say here relates to it.

This second program included 65 candidates—15 laboratory technicians, 15 vocational agriculture teachers, 20 physical education instructors, and 15 English teachers. All 65 had completed four years of higher education or the equivalent. Most were young adults, well chosen and well motivated. We had no complaint about the quality of those selected.

The program was divided into core and segment activities. All the volunteers, during a routine week, participated in 44 hours of core activities, as follows:

Thai Language	19 hours (plus Thai Conversation Tables)
Thai Culture	4 hours
American Culture	4 hours
Physical Fitness	6 hours
World Affairs and Communism	3 hours
Peace Corps Orientation and Working Effectively Overseas	3 hours
Personal Health and Hygiene	2 hours
First Aid	2 hours (for one month only)
Weekly Review and Preview	1 hour

In addition, each of the 15 embryo English teachers spent 12 hours weekly attending classes in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language.

The English Language Institute, through a segment coordinator, administered the classes devoted to training English teachers. Although the program was more specialized, it did not differ substantially from the Institute's regular teacher program. It consisted of three basic courses intended to introduce the student to modern linguistic science, to language pedagogy, and to practical classroom techniques.

The Institute was fortunate in that it had been carrying out for a number of years a Southeast Asian Regional English Project with headquarters in Bangkok and was thus able to assign at least some staff members with Thai experience to the program.

The first course, English Phonetics, introduced the student to the significant sounds of English and their distribution. One phonetics course also compared the sound systems of Thai and English with a view toward giving the student an insight into the English pronunciation problems which Thai students regularly have.

A second course was devoted to English grammatical structures. Its aims were "(1) to give the student a realistic understanding of the facts of English grammar—the parts of speech, function words, and affixes of English, and the various structural layers into which these fit; and (2) to compare the structure of the English language to that of

Thai in order to give the prospective teacher an insight into the problems that Thai students of English will have on the grammatical level."

Both of these courses dealt with linguistics and teaching on a somewhat theoretical level. The third course was planned to draw together the information learned in the other two and reduce it to a very practical, classroom level. The syllabus says:

> METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: This course is intended to give the student an understanding of the approach, methods, and technique that are advocated in modern language teaching. Attention will be paid to the methods and techniques currently in use in Thailand as well as to the textbooks that have wide distribution in the kingdom.

The methods class included a series of visits to intensive course classes held at the university, in person and via closed-circuit television, practice teaching, and the writing of lesson plans. The textbooks included the following:

Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language, C. C. Fries
Selected articles from *Language Learning*, Series 1 and 2
The Structure of English, C. C. Fries
Workbook in English Phonology, H. V. King
Workbook in English Syntax, H. V. King
Teachers' Handbook of Thai Students' English Pronunciation Difficulties, E. M. Anthony

We also had access to the large set of materials developed in Bangkok by our team there and in actual use in the Thai schools, and to manuscript versions of structural comparisons and the like.

Reports from Bangkok indicate that there has been a continuing liaison between Peace Corps English teachers and the few staff Michigan retains in the field.

Evaluation of the program is extremely difficult because of the imponderables involved. The following is offered within a context that should be clear from the start. The context is no more nor less than this: I personally believe deeply in the Peace Corps. I think it has done an outstanding job and that it should, nay, must be continued. I also think it can be improved, both on the university and on the Peace Corps side.

I should first like to make some general comments on Peace Corps programs, then turn to one or two specific items on programs in English as a Foreign Language.

I believe that universities in this country have an obligation to accept the duty of providing the best possible training for Peace Corps personnel. I believe that universities should maintain an affirmative attitude toward Peace Corps programs, provide the best possible faculty, and insist on high standards of performance on the part of the staff and the students.

On the other hand, I believe that the Peace Corps has an equal and correlate obligation to the universities. The first thing I would ask is a channeling of the sense of urgency that pervades Peace Corps programs. I would like the Peace Corps to accept the assumption that adherence to a university's established calendar is possible and beneficial in terms of staff assignments, housing, and quality of instruction.

I should think that Peace Corps-financed lead time would enable a university to prepare better for a program, even to do pertinent research. I should think that a Peace Corps commitment for several programs to one university over a period of years would be desirable. This would allow colleges to build up their resources in particular areas, to establish valuable liaison with countries overseas, and to permit a constant increase in quality instruction, production of efficient materials, and in feedback.

Now for a few comments on TEFL programs themselves. There is, as you all know, a shortage of qualified teacher trainers in TEFL. I can document this by the number of telephone calls I have received in recent weeks from organizations recruiting specialists in English as a Foreign Language, and the University of Michigan has furnished a goodly number of these specialists over the years. When a university adds a Peace Corps program to its other programs, it is faced with a dilemma which can only be resolved by the importation of temporary staff or the stretching of permanent staff to the breaking point. Again, lead time and long-term commitments seem to be the solution.

I believe that we should reexamine the difference between the theoretical and the practical in training teachers. I imagine we at Michigan were not alone in receiving criticism that our course was too theoretical. We, of course, do *not* believe our course was excessively theoretical. We believe that one must begin by placing our discipline in a context of linguistic science, true, but only because we believe that the teacher is a better teacher in the classroom because he has mastered this context. Let me quote from the report that appeared as a result of similar discussions in Ann Arbor in early 1961:

> Over the past twenty years, American-sponsored teaching of English as a second or foreign language has developed according to certain well-defined linguistic and pedagogical principles. Successful teaching in accordance with these principles demands a complete reorientation of the attitude of the teacher toward language, its structure and operation, and toward the process of language learning.
>
> To be specific, the teacher must be firmly convinced of the primacy of the spoken language, not only pedagogically but as a basis for understanding the structure as well. He must think of language as consisting of sets of habits which are capable of systematic and orderly description. He must understand that the conventional grammar he has learned, if indeed he did, is often not the most economical and accurate way to describe the structure of English. He must come to regard language learning as the fixation of sets of habits to the point that they constitute automatic responses to verbal or situational stimuli. He must realize that the points of difficulty in learning a language may be identified in terms of specific contrasts between the structure of the native language of the learner and the language he is being taught.
>
> It is no exaggeration to say that this approach to the language learning-teaching process demands a virtual revolution in thinking about the nature of language. It is not accomplished easily or lightly: in fact, it often encounters considerable resistance. It is only fair to say, moreover, that it will succeed only with the intelligent and intellectually agile. But unless this is the approach, any training course is likely to degenerate into a mere presentation of pedagogical devices, with no rationale behind them and certainly not calculated to produce any real effect.

In short, we wish to be certain that, although our teachers deal with trees, they remain aware of the forest. I am reminded in this connection of what van Loon wrote of Heinrich Schliemann when he was searching for Troy. Schliemann " . . . dug with such zeal and such speed that his trench went straight through the heart of the city for which he was looking and carried him to the ruins of another buried town which was at least a thousand years older than the Troy of which Homer had written."

We want to give our English teachers the tools with which to dig. But we also want to give them a good understanding of why these tools were chosen, where they should make their excavations, and the ability to recognize Troy when they find it.

Inservice Training for Peace Corps Volunteers

Frances Ingemann

As we gain experience in training volunteers for the Peace Corps, we will certainly be able to improve on the first programs, which were often hastily organized by people who knew little about the country for which they were preparing volunteers and who had never before been faced with trying to present so much in such a short time. With a better knowledge of the educational system, the policies of the Ministry of Education, the training of the local teachers, and the materials being used in the country in which the volunteers will serve, we can select the most essential aspects of the large body of material a well-trained English teacher should master. By developing better techniques for making the students aware of what they will need in the field, we can motivate them more highly. We can try to provide practical teaching experience similar to that which they will have in the country. We can learn to make most efficient use of the time available and achieve a proper balance between inclass activities and individual preparation.

Despite the substantial improvement which we can forsee, it will not be possible to turn out fully trained teachers in a ten or twelve week training program. Some continued guidance is necessary in the field.

I would like to share with you some observations of a group of volunteers in service, discuss some of the problems encountered, and suggest a possible solution. Although my remarks are based on just one program, they will, I hope, have some general application.

Most of the volunteers for Costa Rica trained at the University of Kansas had as their technical skill teaching of English. About five months after they began as teacher's aides in Costa Rica, I had the opportunity of spending a day in each locality where a volunteer was serving and sitting in on classes. The purpose was not to evaluate but to give technical assistance where needed. About six months later I returned to Costa Rica to take part in a special summer course for Costa Rican teachers of English. Because the Peace Corps was involved in this course, some of the volunteers assisting in drill sessions and workshops, I was able to learn about their more recent activities and again offer limited technical assistance. This special program also served as a refresher course for the older volunteers who participated and as a training course for a few more recently arrived volunteers who had not had extensive training in English.

As might be expected, activities of volunteers vary depending on the possibilities within the individual school, the personality and training of the Costa Rican counterpart, and the volunteer's own interest and ability. Since many of my later remarks will take a critical vein, let me make clear at the outset that I thought the volunteers were doing a good job within the limitations mentioned. English was being learned better in every school as a result of the volunteer's presence. Although our attention at this conference is focused on English, it should be mentioned that the volunteer's influence was not limited to the English class, but it could be noticed in the school as a whole and in the community. The Costa Rican program has been highly successful.

The specific aim of the training program was to prepare teacher's aides in English for secondary schools. What kind of English teaching activities are the volunteers engaging in now that they have reached the field? Almost all of them did in fact go into the secondary schools and many of them are performing duties one might expect of a teacher's aide: they serve as a model for oral practice, they help the teacher prepare lessons, they work on visual aids, they correct homework and tests. Some have organized extra classes or clubs. A few teach classes regularly while the counterpart observes.

Several volunteers have organized or improved libraries for their schools, and a few are setting up simple language laboratories by using one or two tape recorders and a series of headphones, the money for which is being raised through local projects. However, their activities are not limited to the secondary school. One volunteer is teaching full-time in elementary school, and a number give a class or two at the elementary level. Almost all have evening classes for adults.

Difficulties which the volunteers encountered are of two major kinds: those related to finding their place in their school, and those related to their technical knowledge and skill.

In addition to personality conflicts which inevitably arise when people have to work together, the first volunteers faced the difficulty that their counterparts had not been sufficiently prepared for their arrival. The Ministry of Education had not defined the role of the teacher's aide nor given suggestions as to how the teacher's aides might be used. As a result, the volunteer and counterpart groped around, felt each other out, and eventually fell into some kind of working arrangement. One Costa Rican teacher may give the volunteer little to do because he feels he can do a satisfactory job without the volunteer or because he does not know what contribution a volunteer might make. Another may be so intimidated by the volunteer or, on the other hand, so delighted to have someone else do his work that he turns everything over to the volunteer. Even when such arrangements are mutually satisfactory to the volunteer and counterpart, Peace Corps officials object if the volunteer is not sufficiently active, and the Ministry of Education objects if the volunteer assumes too many of the teaching duties. There will certainly be less difficulty for new volunteers now that it is generally known what volunteers are and what can be expected of them. Nevertheless, some problems will continue to arise.

Because volunteers have had only a bare minimum of training and because they have fallible human memories, they will often need technical assistance in the field if they are to do a maximally effective job. Without such help, some volunteers revert to the older and less satisfactory methods by which they were taught foreign languages. Some adopt the methods of their counterpart, a practice which may be necessary with certain counterparts and even desirable if the counterpart is a skilled teacher, but often stems from the volunteer's inadequate preparation in methodology. In an effort to fit into the system, some have even gone so far as to conduct classes in Spanish, using English only to read from the book, cite examples, or do exercises. Other volunteers use only one or two techniques—thus not only boring the class but also retarding learning. For example, a volunteer may spend hours on choral repetition without ever leading his students to use the language in a meaningful communicative situation. Other volunteers are so carried away by the audiolingual approach that they neglect writing and are producing students illiterate in English.

Some volunteers, particularly those who have never taught before, have discipline problems. The counterpart may be of some help in maintaining discipline, but often the counterpart does not know how to keep order in the class or may use methods which take time from or are not compatible with the planned lesson.

Volunteers often need help when they find themselves in situations for which they have not been specifically prepared. Elementary school teaching and evening adult classes require a modification of techniques and materials.

Finding suitable materials is always a problem. Although the books used as texts in the secondary schools are prescribed by the Ministry of Education, volunteers want supplementary readers and books suitable for their other classes. Bookstores in Costa Rica do not keep in stock a variety of good books and the volunteers are not on publishers' mailing lists which might keep them informed of what is available.

When a volunteer has a problem, he has certain overseas sources he can turn to: the Peace Corps representative, the Ministry of Education, the university, and the binational center. Each of these can be of some help, and yet they do not seem to be sufficient. The Peace Corps representative does not have the necessary technical skill to offer useful advice, and the others do not usually have the time to help the volunteer extensively in his local situation. At best they offer help only when a volunteer seeks them out, and this help is not on a continuing, organized basis.

I would like to propose a change in the concept of training from a program, which the volunteer undergoes before he begins his work, to a program which begins in the United States but is continued through at least his first year of service.

If the country should have a good inservice program for its own teachers, the training of the volunteers may be integrated into the existing program. If not, a person who has conducted training in the United States should go overseas with the volunteers to continue training. Although there may be value in having some group sessions, the inservice training would be primarily individual. The field service person would on a regular basis visit each volunteer in his school, spend sufficient time there to understand the problems, and help him continually to improve his teaching skills. This person should also be available to the counterpart for consultation if the counterpart so desires. Such a program would not only improve the teaching of the individual volunteer and in many instances that of the counterpart, but it might in some countries serve as a model for inservice training to improve teaching generally. By improving the technical skill of the volunteers, the Peace Corps can play a more significant role in upgrading English teaching for the country as a whole, and the volunteer can return home confident that he has accomplished more than giving a handful of students an opportunity to practice their English.

Training Peace Corps Volunteers in Hawaii

Donald I. Dickinson

The University of Hawaii Peace Corps Training Center, located at Hilo on the Big Island of Hawaii, was inaugurated in the summer of 1962, during which summer the first group of North Borneo/Sarawak volunteers were trained. Since then volunteers have been given technical and linguistic training for going to Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. The program director is Dr. John Stalker, Director, Overseas Operations, University of Hawaii.

A major obstacle ably met by Asian language directors training volunteers for effective participation in their Peace Corps assignments was the lack of suitable materials. Text materials for such languages as Indonesian were developed in quantity and on short notice. Native informants gave practice drills and/or produced tapes for use by non-native instructors. A characteristic text format for Indonesian included dialog practice drills illustrating various lexical and grammatical items from the dialog, and later lessons introducing more complex affixational system of Bahasa Indonesian. Besides the usual intensive oral-aural drill, special features of the 250-hour course are (1) night-hour explanations in English of new material to be presented next morning, (2) simultaneous hearing-reading exercises, and (3) frequent listening and repeating of monologs and narratives for increasing vocabulary and fluency. Final tests have shown that the trainees of the particular program mentioned exceeded the goal of 2,000 vocabulary items and are in control of basic phonology and grammar. Dr. Donald M. Topping of the English Language Institute is coordinator for Asian language training. Local observers in the countries to which Peace Corps volunteers have been assigned are amazed at their ability for such a short period of training.

Besides introducing trainees to the phonology, morphology, syntax of English, and contrasting English structure with that of the native language in the area for which the volunteers were being trained, volunteers learned how to use the FSI oral proficiency test and observed demonstration classes. A uniquely successful aspect of the program, however, is actual application of teaching methods in local adult education classes in English. These classes run four nights a week for ten weeks. TEFL staff members observe the work of trainees, and discussions and briefing follow. Teacher trainees have also had opportunity to assist regular teachers in lesson planning, practice teaching, and conferring with teachers about problems in the Hilo public schools.

One might sum up the strength of the Hilo Training Center as its ability to meet any challenge. Although part of the success is due to hard work, more of it is brought through recruitment of expert lecturers. This summer a group totaling 200 trainees will be taught Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, and Thai simultaneously—while a whole new group learns methods in TESL.

III. Some Key Concepts and Current Concerns in Linguistics, Language Learning, and Language Teaching

Harold B. Allen
Face East When Facing Non-English Speakers

J. Donald Bowen
Applications of Grammatical Analysis to Language Teaching

Naguib Greis
Basic Concepts in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language

A. L. Davis
Phoneme and Morpheme

Katharine Aston
Another -eme in Language Teaching: The Grapheme

Ruth Strang
Teaching Beginning Reading: An Introduction and Summary

Edward P. Dozier
Some Thoughts about the "Psychological Reality" of Linguistic Units

Lois McIntosh
First- and Second-Language Learning

Einar Haugen
Bilingualism as a Goal of Foreign Language Teaching

Ruth Roberts
Applications of Reinforcement Learning Theory to Second-Language Learning

Stanley Levenson
Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults—The Audio-lingual Approach

Faye L. Bumpass
Basic Considerations and Sequenced Steps in Teaching Young Children to Read English as a Second Language

Paul W. Bell
An Instructional Program for Spanish-Speaking Elementary School Pupils

Mary Finocchiaro
The Supervisor's Role in Curriculum Development

David P. Harris
TOEFL: A Program for the Testing of English as a Foreign Language

Paul D. Holtzman
Richard E. Spencer
Contributions of Testing to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language

Face East When Facing Non-English Speakers

Harold B. Allen

If you've been wondering about the title of this talk, I have, too. I think that I must have been influenced by the acrostics in the *Reporter* magazine when I made it up. Yet it is not really half so subtle or far-fetched as some of the clues for those acrostics. Up to a point, that it is. For facing east is clearly to face the orient (ultimately), and that means orienting oneself. To orient oneself calls for finding not only the east but also the other points of the compass.

Last summer in Dover, England, I was struck by how the Romans there established the directions. On the headland, just below Dover Castle, is the oldest extant building in Britain, an eight-sided pharos or lighthouse. One side is at a right angle to the east, one to northeast, one to north, one to northwest, and so on, all around the compass. When the channel fog swept in, or even in the darkest night, the Roman soldier could feel the lighthouse wall and orient himself. This must have been pretty comforting.

Admiration for this ingenuity stops, however, when we reflect that the Roman could not carry the lighthouse around with him. Without its eight walls, its eight points of reference, he might easily have become rather confused unless an equivalent means of locating the east was at hand.

I am suggesting this morning that, like a lot of other jobs in the world, our particular job of teaching English to non-English speakers can become confusing and frustrating without proper orientation. For teachers of language this orientation must be provided by eight points of reference. These eight points are eight basic linguistic principles:

1) Language is system.
2) Language is vocal.
3) Language is composed of arbitrary symbols.
4) Language is unique.
5) Language is made up of habits.
6) Language is for communication.
7) Language relates to the culture in which it occurs.
8) Language changes.

Now let's take them one at a time, all too briefly, but I hope with enough consideration to make them clear.

First, language is system. Any given language is a system, a complex interlocking network of patterns, a complex structure. Take a familiar analogy, a school system. You as a teacher are in the system. So is your principal; so is your superintendent, and each counselor and office clerk and custodian, even the football coach. You see all these and the buildings in which they work. But you can't see the system in which they operate nor the theory by which it operates. You simply infer the existence of the system from observing how all these people work together.

So with our language. We infer its existence from observing not only that there are units in it but also how they work together. Once we fully realize the existence of language as system, then our treatment of grammar becomes radically different. We deal with language matters not as isolated features but always in terms of their structural characteristics—their forms and their positions within the system.

Recognizing this, we see how the English sentence is composed of layer upon layer, not of a series of units as suggested by old-fashioned parsing. We see how in spaces or slots within the structures we can put either single words or other complex structures. We know then that progress toward control of the language means increasing control of these structures. We know that to help students gain control of English as new language we must proceed from structural pattern to structural pattern, from simplicity to complexity—and that what may seem to be simple to the adult native speaker actually is a complex interlocking puzzle to the person whose language is a quite different system. Recognition of this is what is leading new textbook writers to incorporate a rigidly controlled sequence by which the student is led from the simple patterns to the involved ones. You will find this structural control, for instance, in the *English for Today* series produced by the National Council of Teachers of English.

But a system, though abstract, does not exist in a vacuum. A language system is primarily observed as speech. This is the second fundamental principle of our orientation, that we approach a language system, we study it, we characterize it, through speech. Only speech provides all the essential signals of the language. Only through speech do we get a clear picture of English inflection so obscured by the spelling—as the letters *d* and *ed* distort the facts of /t, d, ɨd/ (in *hoped*, *learned*, and *expected*, for instance). We distinguish the primary identifying features of a sentence as combinations of pitch and stress and pause, and the secondary features of word position and form (*run*, e.g., in contrast with *running*). Once we accept language as primarily speech, we learn the significance of the sound units which linguists call phonemes. We have then for the first time a basis for understanding clearly the different types of problems the ESL beginner confronts. We have the means for helping him acquire a phonemic contrast which does not exist in his own language, such as English /iy/ and /i/ and Spanish /i:/, and to learn a new allophone for a phoneme which does exist in his language, such as the English semivoiced tap in *latter*. And, of course, because we know that language is primarily speech, we study phonetics, the production of speech, and thus are better able to understand and cope with such a problem as that of axial contrast—the fact that English consonant articulation has its axis farther back than in Spanish. [t], e.g., is a dental stop in Spanish, but an alveolar stop in English.

Further, once we accept language as primarily speech, we do not make the mistake of the teacher of phonics who starts with letters and thinks of sounds as powers or values of a letter. We recognize that the sounds are primary and that the letters are attempts to represent the sounds. We find much more regularity in our spelling system than has been thought, and we thus can do a better job of teaching spelling to these non-native speakers. We see that if writing is essentially the process of symbolizing sound on paper, then reading is the reverse process of translating the visual symbols into sound. It is not essentially a process of getting meaning from the printed page, for if the spoken symbols, the words, do not convey meaning, then the printed ones won't either. And if we put reading first in the process of learning English as a new language, we unnecessarily handicap the student in his progress toward control of speech; indeed, we may successfully block his ever gaining control of it.

The third fundamental is that language symbols, the words by which meaning is conveyed, are arbitrary. Now on one level this should be pretty obvious. We know that we don't call a pig a pig because it is so dirty that there is no other name for it. There is no inevitable relationship between a four-footed animal and the three sequential phonemes /k/, /æ/, and /t/, /kæt/, by which we symbolize it. But unless we are consistently reoriented toward the real nature of language, we might still be tempted to forget that the relationship between symbol and meaning is arbitrary and hence argue that *disinterested* can't possibly mean the same as *uninterested*. We might be tempted to think, and to teach, that the right word is *elevator*, not *lift*; *pail*, not *bucket*; *shades*, not *curtains* or *blinds*; and that the right pronunciation is /koyówty/ not /káyut/; or /ruwf/, not /ruf/. In short, we might be tempted to be pretty arbitrary ourselves if we don't realize that language symbols are arbitrary.

The next fundamental principle, the fourth, is that language is unique. No two languages have the same set of patterns or structures—of sounds, of grammatical signals, or words, or of syntax. English is not German, nor French, nor Chinese, nor Latin. It is not Latin. I repeated that, because for many years our school grammar has misled students by providing them translations of Latin grammatical statements as if these statements were true of English. That has not been a good thing. A Roman two thousand years ago could say *Caronem edim* (I ate the meat), *Caronem edis* (You ate the meat), *Canis caronem edit,* (A dog ate the meat), and a grammarian studying the language could then say that a verb agrees with its subject in person. Now an English grammarian, looking at his own language, should observe that in each of these six examples there is only one form *ate,* with no signal of agreement at all. As a matter of fact, when you include the present along with the past, and then include the subjunctive along with the indicative, you find that in the twenty-four possible places for subject-verb agreement in English, only once—the so-called third person singular present indicative—does such agreement occur. If a statement is 1/24 correct, it is 23/24 incorrect. The English verb simply does not agree with its subject in person and number, and we have no business teaching English to non-English speakers as if it does. English is unique, and our statements about it should be derived from direct observation of it.

The fifth fundamental is that language is made up of habits. I mean simply that our use of the system itself is ordinarily on the habit level; we do not make conscious choices of our actions when we operate the system. It is habitual for me as a native speaker to pronounce language sounds as I am doing right now. I do not stop to think that now I put the tongue tip against the alveolar ridge and withdraw it sharply with a slight aspiration, next constrict the vocal bands while the lips slightly round and the tongue moves to a mid-back tense position before gliding high and back. If I had to do all that I might never even produce the single word *toe,* which I was describing in brief phonetic outline. It is a matter of habit for me to arrange the words in the order which you hear. It is a matter of habit for me to use the particular forms which I am now using, to say, for example, *it is* and not *it am* or *it are* or *it be.* I do not have to stop and think through these choices.

This basic principle means much to us when we teach English. It means that we are not going to get any one to speak English by telling him about the language or by having him memorize paradigms of verbs or by making any kind of prescription or proscription of language forms. A good many studies have shown that this kind of correction does no good, unless it provides the teacher a certain false kind of ego satisfaction. It does no good for the precise reason that habits are acquired through practice and not by prescription. That is why the teacher of English to non-English speakers must use every kind of practice exercise—pattern practice, mim-mem recitation, and substitution drill—in as near a natural situation as the school can provide. One very important value of the language laboratory is that it makes possible much more practice time than the ordinary classroom can.

The sixth fundamental is simply that language is for communication. That seems self-apparent, you might be thinking, and you are right. But a great deal more is implied by that principle than is at first apparent. If when we talk or write, our purpose is to communicate, then the relationship of our language to the receiver is all-important. If what we say makes sense to us, is intelligible to us, that is all very fine; but the criterion that counts is whether we are getting our meaning across to the persons we are talking to. If our pronunciation is misunderstood and our language forms indicate a meaning different from what we intend, then we fail as language users. A major emphasis, then, in teaching English as a second language should be upon the ultimate end of language use by the speaker or writer. Every effort should be made to develop an awareness of this objective in the mind of each student. Such awareness calls for attention to the nature of the receiver; it demands at least a kind of audience analysis.

A great many of the students you teach will have difficulty getting jobs, no matter how able they are, if their English is not Standard English. This is a fact that students can appreciate very early; it is a fact that for some at least provides strong motivation for learning. But they need to be made aware of this in terms of receiver reaction, some kind of feedback from a listener other than a teacher. How to provide this is beyond the scope of this talk, but I am sure that in almost any community some way can be found to do it.

The seventh principle of linguistic orientation is this: Language is related to the culture in which it exists. It is true that many modern linguists study a language as if it exists in a vacuum. This is a neat and tidy way of analyzing its structural features without interference. But they know of course that language does not exist in a vacuum. Language exists in its speakers; and its speakers exist in specific places and specific social groups and specific situations.

Consider their existence in place. English is the daily instrument of people in Arizona, in Minnesota a thousand and more miles away, in Maine; even in England and Australia. All its speakers don't talk in precisely the same way. It may be natural—most of us are pretty egocentric—to think that speech in one's own area is somehow better than that in another. But actually this is nonsense. Regional differences are not necessarily qualitative differences. The implication for us as teachers can be drawn rather easily. We simply have no business suggesting to our students that there is some inherent superiority in the speech of any one region, whether it is Arizona, or Boston, or New York, or England.

While it is desirable to teach the standard language forms of the area in which the students live, it is also desirable to teach that there are often variants equally acceptable—in pronunciation and vocabulary particularly—in other parts of the English-speaking world.

One more fundamental, the eighth and last, must be dealt with quickly. It too seems obvious, yet sometimes we find it difficult to put this principle to use. The principle is this: Language changes. Everything said here about English is subject to change as long as English is spoken. Some features of language change slowly, such as /stɔn/ to /stown/; others more rapidly, like /dɔtər/ to /dɔdər/; some, like the adoption of *sputnik*, almost overnight.

Since language does change, what we say about it today may not be true about it tomorrow. And what was said about it several years ago may not be true about it today. What a dictionary of 1934 reports about the language is not to be taken as a description good for 1964.

But recognizing and accepting one or two of the obvious principles will not be enough if we are to do our work as teachers of English to non-English speakers. Rather do we need to accept all eight of these fundamental linguistic principles if our own orientation is to be sound and consistent. We must face east when we face our non-English-speaking students.

Applications of Grammatical Analysis to Language Teaching

J. Donald Bowen

Most linguists and language teachers share the conviction that the more we know about the structure of a language the better we should be able to teach the skills of using that language. This conviction is easier to accept than to prove, in spite of the fact people have been talking about the application of grammatical analysis for a long time.

Language teaching is still very much an art, and descriptive linguistics is moving only slowly toward legitimate status as a science. While the study of language has encouraged a much more accurate understanding of the systematic behavior through which humans communicate with each other, progress has been slow. Grammar studies have probably always been essentially descriptive, even when the description primarily served the purpose of supplying prescriptive recommendations. But the means and the method of describing have changed, yielding different approaches with different emphases. Sometimes emphasis is placed on semantic categories, sometimes on linguistic form, sometimes on grammatical function. Some analyses emphasize a classification of the parts of a single sentence and the relationship between these parts; others, a classification and contrast of different sentence types.

Traditional grammatical analysis, at least as it was presented in the schools in language classes for native speakers, was based partly on semantic classifications and partly on structural relationships. A noun was the name of a person, place, or thing; a verb expressed action, being, or condition; and interjections were words expressing surprise or emotion; but pronouns were replacives for nouns; articles were markers of relative definiteness; adjectives and adverbs were modifiers of nouns and of verbs, adverbs, and other adjectives respectively; prepositions were relaters; and conjunctions were connectors. This tradition was expressed in scholarly grammars which described the language in great detail, grammars rich in illustrations and examples. The best of these were accurate as well as comprehensive, and they remain the best total descriptions available at the present time. They relied on intuition, but their authors were able to capture the essential structures of the language and describe them meaningfully.

As applied to the language classroom, traditional grammar was frankly prescriptive, aiming to present only one dialect and style level, the one felt to be superior. The pedagogical aim was to improve the use of the language by the native speaker, to eliminate in so far as possible any variation of expression, by cultivating a standard to which all speakers and, more especially, all writers should conform. Usually, no identification was made of the specific needs of second-language students. The same types of presentation were given to both first- and second-language learners.

A reaction to the inadequacies of traditional schoolroom grammar led scholars to an approach that has been called modern structural linguistics. The descriptive aim was ostensibly reduced from the entire language to a given corpus taken from the language. The linguist described only the forms and utterances that appeared in his corpus, using additional forms mainly to fill the holes that emerged in his description. From his analysis he extrapolated in a vague way to the larger structure of the language from which his corpus was taken. Relativity of expression was recognized as legitimate, since more than one corpus could be taken from a language. A single standard of usage was replaced by variant standards, to be selected on the basis of appropriateness. The student was advised to choose the dialect or style level or form of the language that best suited the purpose at hand.

As structural analysis was applied to the language classroom, much more attention was given to form rather than meaning as a basis for classifying. A corpus and related drills were presented in an effort to internalize a particular set of language structures, with the hope that these would be generalized by the students in much the same way the first-language speakers generalize, so that what was learned in one situation could be appropriately applied to another. To a very large extent, the best second-language teaching that is going on at the present time follows this formula, offering large doses of practice until the student is enabled to achieve a feeling for the language somewhat akin to the feeling a native speaker has. Even though we see this method working for a large number of students, we do not clearly understand the processes by which their fluency is realized.

Recently a new approach to the study of grammar has been defined. This approach begins not with the language which is produced, but with the speaker who produces it. An adequate description of a grammar is conceived of as a model of the accomplishment of a speaker, a kind of machine that can do what he does, namely produce well-formed, grammatical sentences in the language. This is done by means of an ordered set of rules which operate something like a computer program. The machine makes certain choices from among those available, and earlier choices have important consequences on later choices.

This approach to grammar is called "generative," to reflect the conception of a model of language production. The generative analogue to modern structural linguistics is a phrase structure analysis, which is in effect a reformulation of IC or immediate constituent analysis.[1] IC analysis typically proceeds from smaller units (distinctive features, phones, phonemes) to larger, more comprehensive units (morphemes, phrases, sentences). Phrase structure analysis begins with a complete utterance or sentence and divides this into its significant parts, finally moving down to the smallest elements of speech.

The generative analogue to traditional grammar is transformational analysis, in which the emphasis is on the relationship between different phrase and sentence constructions. Transformational analysis is a very powerful analytical tool by which relationships intuitively felt can be specified in exact and mechanical terms. Thus declarative and interrogative, active and passive, affirmative and negative can be described by rules of considerable generality, and these rules introduce a welcome measure of simplicity into patterned behavior heretofore considered enormously complex.

The relationships between the earlier and the more recent traditions can be illustrated as follows:[2]

Pregenerative	Modern Structural Linguistics	Traditional Grammar
Postgenerative	Phrase Structure	Transformational Analysis

Pregenerative grammars were characterized by their reliance on the intuitive participation of the native speaker. Postgenerative grammars have attempted to replace intuition by explicitness, that, is by rules so explicitly formulated that they could be tested by mechanical procedures for adequacy and for accuracy. Generative grammar, and particularly transformational analysis, describes the capacities of the speaker, by characterizing the set of restraints and restrictions that the speaker must be assumed to operate under as he produces sentences in the language.

---

[1] Cf. *infra.*

[2] I am indebted to Robert P. Stockwell for helping in the formulation of many of the ideas in this paper and for suggesting several of the examples.

If the generative rules are formulated accurately and ordered properly, they can be applied mechanically to produce sentences. Designing such rules with a sufficient degree of specific detail is a tremendous job, which is far from complete, though promising progress has been made.

The applications to the language teaching classroom of the generative approach to grammatical analysis have not been fully understood. It is partly the purpose of this paper to speculate on these applications to see what potential contributions might reasonably be expected.

But before speculating on the contributions in the future, perhaps it would be useful to point out some of the correlations between different approaches to grammatical analysis and classroom applications of these that have been made in the past. In attempting to show how a view of grammar has influenced teaching, I don't pretend to a complete description; rather I wish to point out some of the features of classroom presentation that have proved to be useful, features that we might wish to keep in an eclectic method based on our best teaching experience.

The traditional grammar taught in the schools provided an understanding of the grammatical structure of the language to be learned. Though the description was not always adequate and was sometimes skewed by unjustified emphasis on unusual or minor patterns, this understanding was helpful to mature students who felt they must know what they were trying to accomplish. Such students are distinctly uncomfortable when participating in blind practice which is supposed to give skill and awareness of patterning as a culmination of classroom drills and exercises. These students want guidance that will give them knowledgeable participation, and to withhold grammatical explanations will adversely affect their morale.

Traditional teaching was strongly prescriptive, but this had a beneficial effect that is difficult to duplicate in a class where a permissive attitude toward variation of usage is encouraged. The student feels disoriented if he can't get specific answers to his questions about what is acceptable or "correct" and what is not.

Adequate guidance and pedagogical prescriptivism are still effective classroom procedures, and attempts to deemphasize them have proved to be counterproductive, especially in teaching older students.

When modern structural linguistics made its influence felt in the language classroom, several new emphases were offered. The most significant was the idea of the primacy of speech over writing, which spawned a new approach to the classroom under the name "oral-aural," more recently amended to the less equivocal "audiolingual." The skills of the spoken language were taught as primary objectives, and success proved that the earlier widely held opinion that students could not learn to understand and produce oral communication in a foreign language was discredited.

One of the consequences of the emphasis on oral language has been a new attention given to features of speech that are not adequately represented in writing. The most conspicuous of these is intonation, the patterns of pitch, stress, and juncture that are so important to oral comprehension. Though they look alike in print, *cóld creàm* is different from *côld creám*, and a *tóy stòre* is not a *tôy stóre*. Even when the written forms are different, suprasegmental signals serve to mark important distinctions in the spoken language. *They vindicated the solution* is not the same as *They've indicated the solution*. There's a great difference in the message of *The women | are outshooting the men* and *The women are out | shooting the men*. Suprasegmental signals in speech show us how words are grouped, information that is indispensable in oral communication. Even in the written form of the language this is important, and if these groupings cannot be supplied by the reader (on the basis of his own oral experience and competence), the meaning may be lost.

Another consequence of the emphasis on oral activities was a new kind of drill, called pattern practice. The systematic exercise of sentences on a single pattern was based on the theory which described language as systematic human habits, and the specific assumption was that speech habits consist of physical correlations that can be learned through the systematic practice of speech patterns.

Modern structural linguistics is perhaps most typically represented by a grammatical orientation that can be referred to as immediate constituent analysis. Sentences are conceived of as groups of functioning elements, each of which is a slot in the structure. Description consists of listing the important sentence patterns, identifying the functioning constituents, and with these constituents as slots, listing the items that can be used to fill them. A very useful contribution to pedagogy of this type of analysis is the substitution drill, which may take several forms for different purposes. A simple substitution drill is primarily a device to learn vocabulary items. Drill sentences are constructed in which a list of words can be substituted for a word in one particular slot, with no grammatical consequences elsewhere in the sentence. Such a drill teaches familiarity with the sentence pattern being manipulated and with the individual items which can be substituted, perhaps showing the semantic common denominator that allows them to fit into the same matrix sentence.

A correlated substitution drill is similar except that the substitutions *do* have grammatical consequences elsewhere in the sentence, giving practice in making concordance adjustments where the sentences require they be made.

An even more sophisticated substitution drill design is the moving-slot type, where the student must identify which slot in a pattern is being manipulated for each substitution, and where a given substitution may or may not require a corresponding change elsewhere in the sentence. These drills are excellent tests of a student's versatility, though they do not always reproduce realistic or natural sequences of utterances.

Substitution drills are well suited to teaching situations where emphasis is given to the oral language. It is easy to model sentences and give substitution cues, and this type of drill can be very useful in making the student aware of the functioning elements in a sentence pattern, consistent with the immediate constituent analysis that lends them emphasis.

The earlier grammars, traditional and structural, those that can be called pregenerative, then, emphasized the pedagogical concepts of adequate guidance, the use of the oral language, and pattern drill, especially substitution drills. More recent grammatical theories have added other emphases, which are logically derived from the models of analysis. Phrase structure analysis, as stated earlier, accounts for the sequence of constituents in a sentence through a series of definitions. A sentence is formed by a sequence of subject and predicate. The subject must have a determiner and a noun, though the determiner may be cancelled out, as before proper names. A predicate must have a verb auxiliary, followed by a linking verb with a predicate adjective or noun, by a transitive verb with a noun object or some kind of complement structure, or by an intransitive verb. Also, in the predicate, any of several kinds of adverbs may appear. The sequence of the items that appear is fixed, and only those items which have certain class membership may appear in the sequence.

Phrase structure analysis accounts for a relatively small number of sentence patterns, those which have been called kernel sentences. These patterns are always fairly simple, active assertions. There are relatively few pedagogical procedures suggested by phrase structure grammar that have not already been implied in immediate constituent analysis. Both suggest substitution drills.

But phrase structure analysis is the point of departure for transformational analysis. Transformations can be thought of as patterns of manipulation for the sentences described in the phrase structure. These transformations specify rearrangement of items, the addition or subtraction of items, or the combination of items from two sentences into one longer, more complex sentence. These functions suggest some very specific types of drills, all of which can be conveniently described as transformation drills. Conversion drills rearrange the items of a sentence, as when an assertion is made interrogative: "He is coming" becomes "Is he coming?" Expansion drills add to the sentence constituents: "He is reading a book" becomes "He is always reading a book." Reduction drills subtract from the sequence of constituents: "He will go tomorrow" becomes "He goes tomorrow." Integration drills combine shorter sentences or parts of shorter sentences in a single longer, more complex sentence: "That man is my uncle" and "He is wearing a yellow tie" becomes "That man with a yellow tie is my uncle."

None of these drill patterns is original with transformational analysis. But transformational analysis makes the grammatical relationships involved specific and gives focus to each relationship. Drills will concentrate on a single point so that comparable rearrangements, expansions, reductions, or integrations are made with each drill sentence.

The significant contribution of postgenerative grammars is their specificity. Each patterned relationship is made in exact and explicit terms and in this way is made testable. Thus the grammar does not rely so heavily upon the intelligent participation of a native speaker who brings his own intrinsic feelings as to what can be said and what cannot, or about whether two sentences have the same or a different pattern. Transformational analysis reaches into the deeper, not just the surface, layers of relationship. We have an explicit basis in the comparative derivation, not in just the resulting patterned structure, for classifying sentences. In other words, two sentences that are identically ordered may have very different grammatical structures. An example can illustrate this: "Shooting stars can be very entertaining" and "Shooting ducks can be very entertaining" are two sentences with surface similarity, yet a native speaker's intuition tells us they are different structures. Nothing in the form of the two sentences distinguishes them; they have the same sequence of constituents, in fact the same words, except for *stars* in the first and *ducks* in the second, both count nouns in plural form. Traditional analysis recognized that these were different sentence types and distinguished the different functions of the two *-ing* forms, calling one a "participle" and the other a "gerund." But transformational analysis shows us HOW the sentences differ and makes the difference explicit and testable by tracing the separate history of derivation of the two: the first comes from "Stars shoot across the sky" but the second from "He shoots ducks."

Other comparable pairs of sentences are just as distinct, in spite of surface similarities of their structures, though traditional analysis made no pretense of recognizing them as different structures, much less of describing the differences. One such pair is:

John impresses Bill as incompetent.
John regards Bill as incompetent.

In the first sentence John is judged incompetent; in the second, Bill is. Another pair is:

Joan was eager to please.
Joan was easy to please.[3]

In the first sentence Joan pleased others, but in the second, others pleased Joan. Generative grammars have techniques that clearly distinguish the two, by referring to the structures of the basic, underlying sentences.

It is this property of transformational analysis that stimulates the imagination of the language teacher. The grammar describes not just the result of language production, the corpus that is created, but the process by which this creation takes place. The significance of the difference can be readily appreciated if we remind ourselves that speaking a language is precisely this sort of creative process, in which speakers consistently produce sentences which have never been produced before. It is very well to begin second-language teaching with some sort of recapitulation of sentences others have prepared, such as memorizing realistic dialogs, learning proper rejoinders, etc. But the ultimate success of the teaching effort must be judged not on how well students reproduce sentences, but on the skill they show in creating new ones, sentences they have never heard or used before, or indeed sentences which no one else has ever heard or used before.

---

[3] Further examples of similar ambiguity are presented in Robert B. Lees' article, "A Multiply Ambiguous Adjectival Construction in English," *Language*, 36, 2 (April–June 1960), 207–221.

In all honesty we must confess that we don't know precisely how this is done. When we have a particularly apt and well-motivated student, we may succeed in helping him internalize the patterns of a second language to a point where he is able to engage in the creative process. But we don't know just how or at what point this begins. Furthermore, the study of language probably won't tell us how this happens. We may hope for insights, but speaking a language is an exclusively human activity, and it is the human, not the linguistic, processes that we must come to understand.

What are the capacities of a native speaker? There are at least two: (1) he can say what he wants to in order to express his thoughts, and (2) he can recognize when a sentence is grammatical. Transformational analysis attempts to characterize the set of restraints and restrictions a native speaker must be assumed to operate under; it tries to describe what knowledge is assumed. But even if we had this knowledge, if the grammar were completely worked out, we still wouldn't know how a human speaker puts it to use. We simply do not know how a language is learned.

Modern theories of grammatical analysis can be of great use to the language teacher. The postgenerative theories are helpful, partly because we have their insights *in addition to* insights provided by earlier experience. Hopefully, there will be *post*-postgenerative theories that will add even more to our understanding. By making grammatical rules more explicit, we can test them for consistency and validity, and this will help us refine our knowledge and analytical techniques. Also, by making the rules more explicit we can make the contrastive analysis of two languages (native and target) a more meaningful exercise. We can define learning problems with more precision and exactness. Perhaps this will enable us to construct drills which are more sharply focused on the specific problems of mastery that are indicated by the analysis. This has been the hoped for application of contrastive analysis in the past, and it is still a valid expectation today.

A few pedagogical applications of generative grammar have been attempted, but these are still rather rudimentary and tentative. Paul Roberts employs one technique in his grammar for native speakers of English, to awaken or increase students' awareness of productive linguistic patterning. He describes and illustrates a pattern, then asks students to create other sentences that fit the same pattern. Note that this requires the student to exercise "sentence sense," which is all right when teaching native speakers. But this is precisely what the second-language learner lacks, and to expect him to provide it without an adequate opportunity to acquire it would surely lead to nonproductive errors when he began to compose sentences.

A simple composition drill which employs generative techniques has been used in teaching a second language. A series of constituents is given, and the student is instructed to produce a sentence by using and expanding these constituents. Such a series might be "man—be—office—long," from which the students produce as many utterances as they can, such as "The man was at the office for a long time," or "The men will be in the office a long time," or "The man has been in the office for a long conference." The question in using techniques such as these is how to encourage the student to produce in a manner that allows him to create out of his own experience, but still guide him in such a way as to avoid errors. In a way the procedure illustrated above is more of a test than a teaching device. It allows us to judge whether or not the student has internalized a pattern sufficiently well to use it in new sentences.

Herein lies the problem: how to develop the ability to use language in such a way that control of form drops from awareness (becomes automatic) so that full attention may be placed on meaning. This is invariably attempted by bringing form into the limelight of total attention for practice and manipulation. How and when does the transfer of attention from form to content occur? The dilemma: how do you submerge consciousness of a pattern by practice which inevitably calls attention to the pattern rather than to the message it carries?

Transformational analysis does not answer this question, nor does any other type of grammatical analysis. It is hardly original to say so, but grammar, more or less accurately as the description is more or less valid, tells us what to teach. The contribution of a good grammatical analysis can probably be stated as follows: the language should be presented in such a way that grammatical relationships are revealed to the extent maximally useful to the student. This involves the sequencing of patterns but does not specify what the order should be. It recognizes the obvious need for presentation but does not outline what form presentation should take. It concedes the need of the student to master grammatical patterns but does not suggest how mastery should be achieved. In other words, knowing the grammar of a language, either as a speaker or as an analyst, does not equip a person to be a teacher of that language. Grammar is the *what*, not the *how*. Information about the what is indispensable, but it is not in itself sufficient for pedagogy.

What guidelines can be offered then for the pedagogue? Perhaps a beginning of the search for an answer to this question is to ask another: Why did the traditional teacher send his student off to Paris to learn French rather than depending on the classroom? The answers are quite obvious: because French is used by more people there, because there is a supporting culture, because of relative isolation from English speakers, and so forth, but perhaps most importantly, because in Paris French was used for real communication.

What can we do in our classes to provide practice in real communication, if it is not possible to go to Paris? I suppose the answer is to bring Paris to the classroom, or at least that part of Paris that accounts for successful language learning. In any natural language learning situation, either first or second, the distinguishing characteristic is communication; the language is used in the context of a real, meaningful, significant situation. Not only the sequence of patterns, but the sequence of message is natural. How can this be adapted to a situation where a second language is learned in a classroom?

One suggestion is that two functions should be distinguished: presentation and practice. In a first-language context, presentation is all that is offered and all that is needed. If one acquaintance with a new item or feature is not adequate for its assimilation, another occurrence will come along, *if* the feature is important. But the first time, the second, and every time, the feature will appear in a meaningful context. No special periods are set aside for grammatical exercises.

In a second-language situation most teachers rely on another function: practice. Practice is added to presentation for at least three reasons: (1) efficiency—to reduce the time necessary for learning, (2) overcoming interference—to minimize the carryover of first-language habits, and (3) intellectualization—to take advantage of the maturity of older learners by consciously utilizing analogy.

Language practice also must have a context, but the context can be rationalized. For the child learner it is a game; for the older learner it is drill, something he must do in order to acquire the physical, muscular coordinations necessary for the production of complex new speech habits. The point to be emphasized is not that this kind of drill is bad, but that it is insufficient. A philosophy of teaching that does not go beyond mere manipulation is doomed to mediocrity. As a profession we language teachers have largely mastered the mechanical techniques of repetition, substitution, and transformation. We can teach students to memorize and act out preconceived roles. We can, in a word, give good beginning classes.

We fall short at the intermediate and advanced levels, and this is the point at which the student needs the most help. He needs the experience in making choices, not the obligatory choices conditioned by the grammatical system, but the optional choices that allow him to conceive ideas and express himself as a free agent. How this can be done in the context of formal education has not been easy to work out.

Language learning is possible where opportunity and motivation exist together. How can we structure a learning experience to provide (or at least encourage) both of these? Obviously the teacher must take advantage of every opportunity to introduce communication into classroom procedures and activities. New lexical items and grammatical patterns should be introduced in a real, meaningful context; practice should be separately conducted; and finally the skills derived from practice should be utilized, again in a real, meaningful context. This can perhaps best be done in the early stages by minimally controlled or free conversation and later on by wide and extensive reading.

The language teacher and the linguist have something in common: both are trying to create a model. The linguist's model is an abstraction, a set of rules that characterize the knowledge and skills that must be assumed to exist in the native speaker. The language teacher is trying to create a "working" model, to incorporate those skills into the response patterns of a human student, to recreate a reasonable copy or at least an approximation of a native speaker. The logical model of the linguist and the working model of the language teacher are of course different in many ways, but they are related in content. We can hope that an advance in the means of achieving one kind of model will provide insights into the means of achieving the other.

Basic Concepts in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language

Naguib Greis

The contribution of linguistics to the teaching of foreign languages has been marked, during the last twenty years, by drastic changes in the textbooks and the methods used. And although the distinction must be clearly drawn between the linguist and the teacher of language, it is significant that the connection between the two has always been close. Specifically, it was Leonard Bloomfield who wrote both "A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language" in 1929 and *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages* in 1942. Since then a great number of American linguists have addressed themselves to the task of either directly writing textbooks or indirectly helping with outline guides.[1] This association between linguistics and the teaching of English as a foreign language can, and indeed does, lead to more effective methods of teaching the language.

But to talk of the "linguistic method" is somehow misleading since linguistics as a science is primarily concerned with the facts of language and not with the method of conveying these facts to the learner.[2] The term, however, is permissible if we mean by it the method that attempts to make use of the findings of linguistics. It is to be distinguished from what has often been called the traditional approach with the modern variations "translation" and "direct." As John B. Carroll admirably describes it, this new method is

> . . . based on the scientific study of language, in which the approach is *initially* through *form* rather than meaning. It emphasizes speech before writing; it frequently entails the use of a native informant as a model of correct speech; it allows the teacher to use the learner's native language (but only for explanations of the phonology, grammar, and lexicon of the target language); it stresses the importance of drill and repetition to achieve overlearning of habits; and to identify the problems which will most tax the learner, it involves a careful linguistic analysis of the similarities and differences of the learner's native language and the target language.[3]

These are at once the characteristics and the criteria which have guided writers of textbooks for the teaching of English as a foreign language since Charles C. Fries and his staff of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan produced the first series of texts, *Intensive Course in English for Latin-American Students*, in 1942. The basic principle is that language is a set of habits, and the learner while coping with a second set of habits confronts the task of adapting himself to two different sets. A contrastive analysis of the two languages would therefore be of great value in guiding the learner as to which features to ignore and which to attend to.

A key to the new approach to language consists to a large extent in the concept of "grammar." It is not easy to define the term in a manner that will satisfy all linguists for the simple reason that it has been one of the basic points of change in the last ten years. One definition given by W. Nelson Francis is "the branch of linguistic science which is concerned with the description, analysis, and formalization of formal language patterns."[4] A more specific analysis of the "grammatical core" of a language is given by Hockett as consisting of the following four parts:

---

[1] Outstanding among the linguists who have directly contributed to teaching of foreign languages are Bernard Bloch, George L. Trager, Charles C. Fries, and Harold B. Allen.

[2] See John B. Carroll, *Research in Second-Language Learning: A Review of the Literature and a List of Research Problems* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

[3] *Ibid.*

1) its part-of-speech system;
2) its grammatical categories;
3) its functions;
4) its construction-types and constructions.[5]

This "grammatical core," according to Hockett, is extremely important in effective foreign language teaching. It should be noted that he conceives of language as "a complex system of habits," of which the three central subsystems are the grammatical, the phonological, and the morphophonemic. As far as the mastery of a foreign language is concerned, he points out that "Apart from pronunciation and morphophonemic difficulties . . . the chief obstacle . . . is the difference between its grammatical core and that of the learner's own language."[6]

A somewhat different concept of "grammar" is provided by Chomsky. In a recent article, he maintains that "It is reasonable to regard the grammar of a language **L** ideally as a mechanism that provides an enumeration of the sentences of **L** in something like the way in which a deductive theory gives an enumeration of a set of theorems. (Grammar, in this sense of the word, includes phonology.)"[7] What Chomsky and the transformationalists expect of grammar is not merely description or classification; it should account, in Lees' words, "not merely for the sentences of the text in hand, but also for many other sentences which have never been uttered before, but which could be uttered naturally by a speaker of the language in general."[8] In *Syntactic Structures*, Chomsky suggests three linguistic levels in grammar: phrase structure, transformational structure, and morphophonemics.[9] Chomsky does not deal with intonation patterns in his rules. An attempt, however, has recently been made by Robert P. Stockwell in this direction.[10] But it may be a safe generalization to say that the transformationalists' contribution has been mainly in the area of syntax rather than that of phonology.

With the increasing interest in applying the discoveries of modern linguistics, a great number of textbooks have been written by people who claim that they are utilizing the new approach. This, however, should not blind us to the fact that good intentions do not necessarily prove the value of the accomplishment. For, as Hall points out, "well-meaning and enthusiastic but naive students often develop an enthusiasm for the results and implications of linguistics without acquiring a comparable knowledge of its techniques, especially the more complicated."[11]

The new approach, or as it is sometimes called, the structural approach, is not concerned with "definitions" or "correctness" but with the significant elements of order and form that signal relationships and constitute the grammatical structure of the language. Through scientific description many problems may be explained, and it is only after this description has been given, that pedagogy and learning theories may step in to help achieve the solution to language problems.

---

[4] W. Nelson Francis, "Revolution in Grammar," *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, ed. Harold B. Allen (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 69.

[5] Charles F. Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 266.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[7] Noam Chomsky, "Skinner: Verbal Behavior," *Language*, 35. 26–58.

[8] Robert B. Lees, "Review of Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*," *Language*, 33. 375–407.

[9] Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1957), p. 46.

[10] Robert P. Stockwell, "The Place of Intonation in a Generative Grammar of English," *Language*, 36. 3 (July–September, 1960).

[11] Robert A. Hall, Jr., Review of *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, *Language*, 35. 353–354.

Both linguists and language teachers have recognized pattern practice as a basic principle in sound language teaching. Furthermore, it is supported psychologically by the Gestaltists and applied by linguists as indicated in the way grammatical structures are explained.[12] As Robert Lado maintains, the purpose of pattern practice is "to reduce to habit what rightfully belongs to habit in the new language,"[13] and therefore repetition should be accompanied by variation so that the student learns not a particular sentence but a basic grammatical structure that has a maximum of generality.

Vocabulary is the least difficult and the most changeable part of a language. It is definitely much more important for the learner to know the order of morphemes than their lexical meaning, for as Hockett indicates, a few hundred "contentives" are sufficient as examples to show how the other contentives work.[14]

In analyzing the different aproaches to phonology, grammar, and vocabulary, we should never forget the fact that language learning is primarily a process of synthesis. A person may know a great deal about the structure of a language but that does not mean that he has learned that language. In fact a child learns a language faster than an adult partly because he starts with synthesis rather than with analysis. But of course the material for teaching must be carefully analyzed before it is presented to the learner. Hence the need for bridging the gap between the linguist's work and that of the teacher, between the linguistic information and the cultural content.

Selected Bibliography

Allen, Harold B. (ed.).. *Readings in Applied English Linguistics.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964. (Parts II, V deal with linguistics and the teaching of grammar.)

Bloch, Bernard, and Trager, George L. *Outline of Linguistic Analysis.* Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942, 1950. (The booklet is designed ''to present in brief summary the techniques of analysis which are necessary for learning a foreign language. . . . '')

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933. (Chapters 5, 6, 8 discuss phonemes and phonetic structure.)

———. *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages.* Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

Carroll, John B. *Research in Second-Language Learning: A Review of the Literature and a List of Research Problems.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1957. (The author describes it as ''part of an attempt to construct a formalized general theory of linguistic structure, and to explore the foundations of such a theory.'' It is a basic reference in transformation grammar.)

Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

———. ''American Linguistics and the Teaching of English,'' *Language Learning,* 6, 1 and 2 (1955), 1–22.

Gleason, H. A., Jr. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955, 1961. (Revised edition has two chapters on transformations.)

Hockett, Charles. *A Course in Modern Linguistics.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

Lado, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

---

[12] Edward Sapir refers to the contribution of psychology to linguistics in "Linguistics and Its Status as a Science," *Language* (1928).

[13] See *An Intensive Course in English* by the English Language Institute Staff, Robert Lado, director; Charles C. Fries, consultant (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958).

[14] Hockett, p. 265.

Phoneme and Morpheme

A. L. Davis

Two of the fundamental concepts of modern linguistics, the *phoneme* and the *morpheme*, are usually explained in language so technical that they are exceedingly difficult to understand. In my brief discussion of them, I shall try to avoid the use of technical terminology in so far as it is possible.

It is only in the past few decades that the nature of the phoneme has been explicitly described, but the idea must have been reasonably clear to the earliest alphabet makers, who symbolized in writing the sound units of their languages. The vocal organs are capable of making a vast number of adjustments which result in physically different sounds. But the number of contrasting sound units for any language yet investigated seems never to be larger than about seventy, with an average for most languages of perhaps thirty or forty. No language makes use of all the possibilities, and it organizes those which it does use into contrasting units; the different sound units result in different meanings. These sound units are phonemes.

If we make a quick examination of English, we can readily discover most of these units. Taking a series of words which have different meanings, like *pit, Pimm, pin, pick, pig, ping,* I think we would be willing to agree that the first parts are similar, but that they end differently. Or if we have *pop, top, mop, cop,* we have differing beginnings. For *pit, pat, pet, pot, putt, put,* we have differing middles. These contrasting units, or phonemes, result in words with different meanings.

Continuing this process of looking for contrasts will give us a list of phonemes something like the following:

p—pick	**t**—tick	**k**—kick		
b—bot	**d**—dot	**g**—got		
m—man	**n**—Nan			
f—fin	**th**—thin	**s**—sin	**sh**—shin	**ch**—chin
v—vine	**th**—thine		**z**—Zen	**j**—Jim
r—real	**l**—leap	**h**—heap	**w**—weep	**y**—yeast
ng—sing,	singer		**z**—measure,	rouge

We see here that **ng** does not occur at the beginning of words but does contrast in the middle of words and at the end; **z** behaves in the same way; **h** does not occur in the final position.

iy—peek		**uw**—boot
i—pick		**u**—book
ey—cake	**ə**—pup	**ow**—boat
e—deck		
	a—pop	**ɔ**—caught
æ—back		

These and similar sets give us our vowel contrasts. However, for some United States dialects there are additional contrasts. Some have an extra stressed high central vowel, made with the tongue raised toward the middle of the mouth: *dinner, ribbon, wish, children.* Some speakers lack the contrast between the a:ɔ vowels, so that *cot-caught, collar-caller* are homonyms. In addition, some speakers have a contrast between long and short as in *Tommy-balmy* and because of such speakers, the inventory must reflect this difference.

As native speakers of English, each sound unit in its various occurrences sounds the same to us. Yet if we do a little careful listening, we soon discover that there are clearly audible differences. **R**—when isolated in such words as *red, thread, dry, try*—demonstrates this. In *red* the tongue is humped up and compressed, the sides touching the molars. In *thread* there is a fast tongue tap at the ridge behind the teeth. In *try* and *dry* the tongue tip moves backward along the tooth ridge in a kind of scrape, with the buzzing sound less audible in *try* than in *dry*. As another example: the **l** of *lip* is made far forward in the mouth, while the **l** of *pull* is made with the tongue humped up toward the back of the roof of the mouth. Again, the two **k**'s in *King-Kong* are produced with the tongue in quite different positions. Or, if we examine the **p**'s of *pit, spit, nip,* we see that there is considerable explosion of air for the first, but not for the second, and that the last may or may not have the accompanying puff of breath. Additional variations of this kind can be found for most of the sound units. They are, for the most part, caused by the accompanying sounds. That is, the front **k** of *King* is preceding a front vowel; and the back **k** of *Kong* is preceding a back vowel. On the other hand, the case of the strongly aspirated initial **p** (and of some other strongly aspirated **p**'s in English) does not seem to be quite the same. Perhaps, in this instance, it is better to say that the strong aspiration is simply a characteristic of English. With the final **p** in *nip* it apparently makes no difference whether the release is made or not. Any variation which is predictable or automatic is called a conditioned variation; those that are unpredictable, as in *nip,* are called free variations.

Although we can train ourselves to hear these variants, they are still similar enough so that we can group them with the sound units, or phonemes; but it is helpful to give the variants a name of their own and call them allophones. The allophones of a phoneme are phonetically similar to each other and occur in conditioned or free variation.

While the phoneme is a minimum sound unit which makes a difference in meaning, it does not *in itself* have a meaning. Meaning units which can no longer be split in smaller parts, each with a meaning, are called morphemes. Such sequences of phonemes as: *d-o-g, c-a-t, b-o-y, b-o-o-t,* etc., do not yield two or more pieces, so they are morphemes. *Chicago, Mississippi, Miami, Seattle* (possibly divisible in some Indian languages) are not divisible in English, so they also qualify as morphemes. A morpheme, then, can be polysyllabic.

Dogs is the morpheme *dog* with something added; that is, an additional morpheme composed of one phoneme. *Pulling, pulled, taller, tallest, hears, heard* are morpheme sequences, the additional morpheme, as in *dogs,* being inflectional. *Redness, falsehood, baker, width* are likewise morpheme sequences, since the suffixes change the part of speech and therefore, in this sense, have meaning. These added morphemes, or suffixes, are derivational. In such words as *wide-width, long-length, broad-breadth* there is also vowel change. These are grouped together because they form a pattern and are semantically related. In the past tense of verbs the **ed** of *walked* is pronounced **t**; in *rained* it is pronounced **d**; and in *waited* becomes **id**. Strong verbs, like *run-ran, sing-sang, write-wrote* show vowel change without the **ed**. The vowel itself can be classed with the **ed**. With verbs like *go-went* or *is-was,* the stem is completely changed, but they complete the pattern and are semantically similar. Such variants of the morpheme are called allomorphs, parallel with the allophones for the phoneme. Morphemes alone or in combinations forming words are listed in dictionaries, with their meanings.

The *native* speaker of a language, as he learns the language, learns the proper use of allophones, of allomorphs, and of longer structures. They become so automatic for him that he seldom gives them any thought, although he may, now and then, be puzzled about such things as the correct plural for a word like *cherub,* or *hippopotamus,* or *alumna.*

ADEQUATE LEARNING OF A SECOND LANGUAGE REQUIRES THIS INTERNALIZING OF THE NEW LANGUAGE.

The learner of English as a second language brings with him his automatic habits, both of speaking and of reacting to what he hears or reads. Analysis of his language compared to the analysis of the new language is vital to our pedagogical purposes. It is this comparison that enables us to understand our students' problems. We can see, then, why a Spanish speaker has trouble with *peach* and *pitch,* with *berry* and *very,* and with other phonemic distinctions which do not occur in his native speech; we can understand why he has trouble with the allophones of **r**, where his ingrained habit is to use a flap or trill; we know why he says *estupid* and *estory.*

Comparison of languages at all levels—allophone to phoneme; distribution of phonemes; allomorph and morpheme; syntax, sentence structure, semantics, style—this is one of our most practical tools for teaching English as a second language.

Another -eme in Language Teaching: The Grapheme

Katharine Aston

Writing, a system of arbitrary, visible symbols existing in meaningful contrasts to represent the phenomena of speech, is made up of minimal, significant contrastive units called graphemes (such as the letters of the alphabet) which admit of certain variant forms known as allographs.[1] For example, lower case **a**, capital **A**, and Italic *A* are all variant forms of the grapheme unit < a >. The graphemes with their allographs make up the code of the system of written communication which members of a language group have in common. This socially shared code lies behind and makes possible each act of written communication from one individual to another. Every physical manifestation of the ideal code symbol, the grapheme, in each act of writing, is known as a graph.

Every language which is recorded in writing has its own system, an adaptation of one of the basic types of writing. However, the squiggles are not organically tied to the language they record. The squiggles used to record one language can have new significance attached to them so that they can record another totally unrelated language. Persian, an Indo-European language, for instance, uses the Arabic system of writing. Japanese has been recorded with Chinese characters and the Latin alphabet, as well as two syllabaries.

The graphemes of the writing system may be considered, first, as *characters*, i.e., particular contrastive configurations in certain prescribed distributions, and, secondly, as *symbols*, or representatives of certain segments of the speech act or language.

Graphemes, as characters or squiggles, should have clear, distinctive configurations. Each grapheme should contrast with every other grapheme in at least one significant feature. For example, the contrast might be one of shape, as in the English **U** and **V**, where a curve contrasts with an angle; or the contrast might be one of size as in the loops of the handwritten *e* and *l* or the lower loops of *b* and *f*. Notice that the size of the top loops in the last two letters is not significant. The significant contrastive features of these configurations are part of the code known to the group, but they are not always clear to those outside the system and may pose problems for the learner.

Besides the contrasts of the configurations of the squiggles, there are the conventions of their distribution.

There are various types of surface distribution. Compare the vertical writing in columns arranged from right to left commonly used in Japanese and Chinese writing, the right to left horizontal distribution of the Arabic system, the horizontal boustrophedon found in ancient Roman and Greek writings, and the left to right horizontal lines of the English system.

Another type of distribution based on form and space may be called unit distribution. In this, space is used for blocking off units of discourse, such as the paragraph, the sentence, and the word. Anyone who types a language, such as English, which makes use of this space grapheme is especially aware of these conventions measured with precision by the machines, where the largest item on the keyboard is the space-bar.

Inside the small unit of the word, there are also rules of distribution regulating the combination and position of graphemes. Only certain combinations and certain positions are permissible. For instance, the grapheme < v > cannot occur in final position in English, but has to be followed by < e >. The combination < kn > as a symbol for /n/ may occur, but only in initial position.

---

[1] Especial credit is due W. Nelson Francis, whose scholarly analysis and excellent examples in "Writing It Down: Graphics," Chapter 8 of *The Structure of American English* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1958), served as the source of much of this discussion of writing as a system and the following analysis of the English writing system.

A grapheme, as already mentioned, is more than a squiggle in a certain distribution; it is also a symbol. It relates to some segment of the language act. Just as configurations and distributions differ from one writing system to another, so, too, do the types of language segments which are symbolized. In no writing system used for regular communication are all the features of a speech act recorded. There is always a selection. The type of the writing system depends on the type of segment recorded. Ideally, in any type of writing there should be a one-to-one fit between the speech and the writing systems. The segment of the writing system should fit the segment of speech selected for recording; there should be a distinct written symbol for this distinct speech segment and vice versa.

Based on the segment recorded, the following types of writing can be listed:

1) Logographic and morphographic writing. (These are sometimes listed together under logographic writing.)
2) Syllabic writing.
3) Phonemic or alphabetic writing.
4) Phonetic writing. (This precise recording of sound features, significant and nonsignificant, does not have currency as a regular communication system.)

In the recording of English there is evidence of several types of writing. Examples of logographic writing are: < $, ¢, &, %, ×, ÷, +, −, 1, 2, 3 >. An approximation to morphographic writing can be seen in such forms as < and >, which stands for all the allomorph variants in speech /ænd, eyənd, ən, ṇ/. But even here, though the various phonemic shapes of allomorphs are ignored, the writing pattern is made up of three distinct graphemic configurations, which not only may represent in this morpheme three phonemes /æ n d/ but also may enter freely into other combinations to record other morphemes. The productive system of recording English is fundamentally phonemic or alphabetic.

However, the numerous spellings of /iy/ (as in < p*eo*ple, s*ee*, b*e*, b*ee*, qu*ay*, k*ey*, bel*ie*ve, rec*ei*ve, mach*i*ne, am*oe*ba >), the various sounds for the writing pattern < ough > (< bough > /baw/, < rough > /rəf/, < kough > /kɔf/, < hiccough > /hikəp/, < through > /θruw/, < though > /ðow/), the single graphemes recording double sounds (such as < x > for /gz/ and /ks/), and the double graphemes recording single sounds (such as < ng > for /ŋ/) indicate the complexity of the system and the extent to which it has departed from the ideal, i.e., one grapheme having only one sound equivalent and that sound equivalent being expressed by only that grapheme. In fact, as Nelson Francis points out, there is only one symbol in the writing system that really almost satisfies this one-to-one correlation in both directions. That symbol is the grapheme < v >. Even with this grapheme, besides its use in some proper names and loan words from German and Slavic (where < v > represents /f/), there is the previously mentioned restriction on its use in final position; and there is also the single word *of*, where the grapheme < f > represents the sound /v/. This irregularity of fit derivse from the basic difficulty that the symbols of the alphabet are not so numerous as the significant sounds in English. The alphabet is not the complete inventory of the English graphemes. Other features besides the speech segmentals (vowels and consonants) are recorded in the English writing system. Squiggles used to record these features in writing are punctuation marks, such as the following common ones, which include both morphological and syntactic marks: < ' - , ; : — . ? ! ") >. The features recorded by these marks are related to the grammar structure, which may be reflected in the suprasegmentals (pitch, stress, juncture) of speech. (However, compare *Mary is leaving?* with *When is Mary leaving?* Both terminate in question marks; yet the tone patterns are strikingly different.) The distribution of these marks is regulated by conventions that even a native speaker of English has to spend many years learning.

Besides these thirty-seven segmentals (the alphabet and punctuation) and the space graphemic feature, a kind of zero grapheme, there are several suprasegmentals in writing. These are features like capitalization or italicizing, imposed—again according to certain conventions—upon the segmental features of the writing system. Based on these features are built conventionalized systems of allographs, such as capitals, small capitals, italics, lower case, boldface, and so on.

All these conventions of writing may be subjected to the conscious manipulation of creative writers of literature and advertising copy. The poetry of e. e. cummings, for instance, and advertisements through all visual media abound in these intentional deviations. Communication from these deviations depends upon the reader's knowledge of the underlying system. Once one is in the system, he knows the significant features and the permissible deviations. By contracting these new intentional deviations with the neutral patterns of the social code, the reader derives the fresh experience of communication that is intended—unless the writer deviates so far that communication breaks down.

Unfortunately, however, not all deviations represent conscious attempts in the realm of art. There are many unintentional ones, such as mistakes in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling, that both members of the English language community and foreigners are guilty of.

All learners of the English writing system are confronted with complexities that are not easy to master. These complexities stem more from the distribution of the graphemes and their symbolic functions than from the configurations of the squiggles, which are comparatively few.

Of special interest are the problems encountered in the recording of the speech segmentals. Some of the difficulties are typical of foreigners; others are common to both foreigners and native speakers.[2]

The foreigner attempting to record English speech, for instance, has a particular problem. Recording a sound necessitates recognition of it. The native speaker, even the child, with his years of previous experience in using the sounds of English, hears differences in the significant sounds although he may not be able to analyze the system or even be aware of its existence. The foreign student, on the other hand, has to learn to hear these differences to distinguish the meaningful English sounds. The phonemic contrasts of English may not exist at all in his native tongue, or, at best, be only phonetic variants, which, lacking significance for him, might easily escape his notice. "Deveropment," a Japanese deviation, is an example of a mistake arising from such circumstances.

Moreover, if the foreigner is not an illiterate in his own language, he is faced with problems of transfer from the previously learned writing system to the new one. Transition from any one of the basic types of writing systems to another entails a fundamental reorientation of the learner to the new dimensions of symbolic significance for the squiggle. However, even the transition from one alphabetic system to another involves problems of various kinds and degrees of difficulty. Cognate experience in writing systems is not always an advantage. It brings intereference as well as facilitation to the learning process.

This interference is even greater among the various adaptations of the Latin alphabet, where the configurations are similar but the distributions and symbolic functions differ: < i > and < y >, for example, are used to record /iy/ in Spanish. In some instances, /iy/ in English also is recorded by the letter < i > as in < ski > or the spelling pattern < i > C < e > (where **C** stands for a consonant and the < e > is a silent diacritic), as in < machine >; but usually the /iy/ sound is represented in English by one of several other patterns, such as < ee, ea, ie, ei, e > and so on in a consonant environment. The < i > in English spelling, on the other hand, is the grapheme regularly used to record the sound /I/; the grapheme < y > is a less common grapheme for this sound. When the Spanish speaker substitutes the < i > grapheme for the < e > grapheme in recording /iy/, as in his use of the Spanish < mi > for < me >, he has heard the sound correctly, but he has substituted the Spanish spelling pattern for the English one. (The fact that < mi > /miy/ and < me > /mey/ both exist in the Spanish pronominal system would only aggravate the confusion.)

---

[2] Especial credit is due to unpublished notes and mimeographed spelling materials of the late Mrs. Helen Brennan. Her work was particularly helpful in this discussion of unintentional deviations and the later presentation of the pattern approach to writing.

Whereas the deviations caused by either the inability to discriminate English sounds or the confusion of writing systems are typical of foreigners, another type of deviation, such as the spelling of *cheap* as "cheep," is common to both foreigners and native speakers. Here the sound is recognized, but there is a confusion in the English patterns for recording it. This type of deviation can be ascribed to the previously mentioned irregularity of fit of the alphabet and the English phonemic system. Multiple patterns for the recording or spelling of the same sound are sources of confusion.

The question arises: What can be done to solve the problems posed by the English writing system or, at least, to ease the burden of learning it? Various modifications of the conventions governing mechanics have been recommended. However, the suggestions which have been the center of the greatest interest and controversy in recent years are focused on the spelling difficulties stemming from the irregularity of fit.

Some of these solutions are more radical than others, ranging from a completely new alphabet or an augmentation of the old one to simplified spelling reforms, in which the letters of the present alphabet are rearranged into more uniform morphographic patterns, such as the substitution of < nite > for < night >. But acceptance of any of these suggested improvements is far from universal. In fact, for the present and probably for some time to come, people who write English are going to be faced with the status quo of the writing system and therefore must find some intelligent approach to mastering it.

Various experiments in introducing the learner to the written record of English speech have been made. There are the augmented temporary stepping-stone or teaching-learning alphabets, such as Pitman's Initial Teaching Alphabet (i/t/a). Even though claims of phonemic or, worse still, phonetic accuracy for these recordings are misleading since in these, just as in the traditional writing system, allomorphic variants may be ignored, the use of these alphabets has produced remarkable results in helping children crash the symbol barrier of the English writing system. There are also the more truly phonemic transcriptions used for some time now in texts for foreigners, which have usually served more as visual aids to learning the speech patterns than as links to the recording of them.

But regardless of the introduction to the English system of writing, the mastering of traditional orthography has remained difficult. Some order is brought to the apparent chaos by a pattern approach. Each sound is recorded by a limited number of writing patterns, which can be divided into the common spelling patterns, the less common ones, and the combinations that are exceptions to be memorized.

For example, the sound /i/ is usually recorded by the letter < i > plus one consonant or more. The essential constituents of the pattern are < i > C, where **C** represents a consonant, as in < in > /in/ or < it > /it/. The addition of other consonants is optional: C < i > C, < pit >; CC < i > C, < spit >, < i > CC, < imp >;

< i > CCC < itch >. But there is no pattern C < i >, and the pattern < i > without any consonant records the diphthong /ay/. A less common spelling pattern of the sound /i/ is < y > in a consonant environment, as in < myth, rhythm >. < Women > is an example of an exception that must be memorized. It is the only English word in which the sound /i/ in a stressed syllable is recorded with the letter < o>. Other exceptions are represented by < live, England, been (American English), busy, sieve >. Exceptions, however, are few.

Spelling patterns of some other sounds are more complicated. Nevertheless, there is still a finite number of patterns for each sound. This ordering of spelling data around sound patterns should ease the learning burden.

It will be noted that the attempts to deal with the writing problem have been based on the fundamental concept that writing is secondary to speech in essence and chronology of development. This observation gives rise to the following recommendation for teaching the English writing system:

> Proceed from the sounds to the written configurations recording them. Build into the native speaker of English an awareness of the sounds he already knows and uses automatically, and show how they are recorded. Train the foreign student to hear, recognize, and produce the sounds of English before he attempts to write them.

Teaching Beginning Reading: An Introduction and Summary

Ruth Strang

Many methods of teaching beginning reading have been developed. Each has appeared to offer a magic formula for teaching children to read. Each method "gets results."

Three major views are competing for top priority: the "organic-creative," the phonetic, and the linguistic.

The organic-creative approach is based on children's life experiences and creative expression. Forty years ago Ann Nolan Clark used the experience story method successfully with Indian children. Recently, Sylvia Ashton-Warner in her book, *Teacher*, described how she taught beginning reading using words, captions, and little stories that had intense personal significance to the undisciplined Maori children. Thus she bridged the gap between the children's inner world of thoughts and feelings and the outer, alien task of learning to read.

The second major method proposed as a solution to the problem of teaching beginning reading is phonics: the application of sound-letter associations of elementary phonetics to reading and spelling.

Many systems of phonics have been developed and promoted. The Laubach method of associating picture, letter, and word has demonstrated its effectiveness in reducing the illiteracy of people in many lands. The *Phono-Visual* system based on the correct pronunciation of speech sounds in pictured key words has been successfully used with children from non-English-speaking homes. The *Phonetic Keys to Reading*, which requires children to learn a very large number of rules of pronunciation and syllabication, also claims to have solved the problem of teaching beginning reading. Sister Caroline's *Breaking the Sound Barrier*, with its emphasis on the thinking process in word recognition, has many followers. Advocates of these and other phonic systems all report remarkable progress in reading by pupils taught by their system.

Recognizing that beginning reading is made difficult and confusing for children by letters that do not have consistent sounds, Sir James Pitman developed the *Augmented Roman Alphabet*, now known as the *Initial Teaching Alphabet*. Each of the forty-four written symbols that replace our present alphabet represents a single sound. Experiments with the i/t/a in England and in the United States show convincingly that five- and six-year-old children learn to read more quickly and easily than children taught with the traditional alphabet.

The new linguistic readers likewise promise a solution of the problem of teaching beginning reading. The McCracken-Wallcutt, the Smith-Stratemeyer, and the Fries-Wilson series all stress sound-symbol association control in place of the vocabulary control of the traditional basal readers. The Fries-Wilson series teaches patterns or clusters of letter forms and sounds. It also emphasizes sentence structure. All of these linguistic methods also report marked success in teaching beginning reading.

The success of such diverse methods may be explained in several ways:

1) Any new, experimental method, being stimulating to teachers and pupils, evokes more interest and effort than old familiar methods.

2) The teacher's personality and skill may make the difference. A Chinese proverb

says, "A good method used by a bad person gets bad results; a bad method used by a good person gets good results."

3) Other sound psychological features used in the teaching process rather than the experimental method per se may be responsible for the favorable results.

4) Children can learn to read by a variety of methods.

Should we not use the best elements of all these methods, flexibly as appropriate to the particular group we are educating, and in accord with sound principles of teaching beginning reading? Such a program would take into account:

The individual child's physical, intellectual, emotional, and social readiness to learn to read,

First words and other beginning reading material of personal significance to him in his culture,

Understanding of the nature and structure of the English language,

The psychology of learning and motivation,

Methods and materials that creative teachers have found effective.

All these aspects may be integrated into a flexible pattern of teaching reading. The test of its effectiveness is whether or not the children learn to read (in the broader sense of the term) and whether or not they enjoy reading.

Some Thoughts about the "Psychological Reality" of Linguistic Units

Edward P. Dozier

Descriptive linguistics has been heralded as having discovered or devised linguistic units which have "psychological reality." It is believed by a number of linguists, for example, that the phoneme and the morpheme are the "natural" units of linguistic perception and behavior. Thus, a listener is thought to be making a series of decisions in terms of units like the phoneme and the morpheme, while a speaker makes a similar series of decisions in which he produces these units. This selection is, of course, thought to be automatic and unconscious. If it is true that these units have psychological reality, then the whole matter of second-language teaching and learning has been put on a revolutionary plane. Most psychologists and language teachers will agree that if we can synchronize linguistic units with perceptive categories of a native speaker, the teaching and learning of languages would be enormously simplified. Unfortunately psychologists are not decided whether linguistic units are "natural units" or simply convenient and useful analytic categories in descriptive linguistics.

It is generally believed that the members of a phoneme, the allophones, are too small to serve as linguistic units. But observation of English speakers, at least, also indicates that the phoneme itself may be dependent on the selection of a preceding or following phoneme. Thus, speakers and listeners select at least two phonemes, perhaps a syllable as "natural units."

At this point we might ask whether the selection is being made purely on phonemic grounds or because the phonemic sequence or syllable is also a morpheme? At present the question has not been resolved, and until appropriate tests are devised, it will not be possible to provide an answer.

Within the level of morphology and syntax a number of other questions arise: (1) Does the native speaker perceive either allomorphs or morphemes? (2) Are all peoples aware of the word in the ordinary conception given it by English speakers? and (3) Where is the separation line between the morpheme, the word, and some syntactic unit such as a phrase or a sentence?

With respect to the first question, linguists believe that the allomorph like the allophone is ignored in ordinary speech. Saporta, Osgood, and Sebeok (1953:62) give a good example of this by noting that the English listener ignores the phonemic difference between singular "house" /haws/ and the corresponding allomorph in the plural "houses" /hawz-/. The phonemic difference between /s/ and /z/ is neutralized indicating that a unit larger than the phoneme is being perceived.

Thus the morpheme appears to be both a linguistic and a psychological unit at least in English. Attempts to set up the syllable as a linguistic unit have been unsuccessful. Syllables apparently do not correspond to morphemes in all languages, and observational studies indicate that syllables do not operate as perceptive units either.

Another popular conception is that native speakers and listeners are aware of the word in its ordinary English definition in all languages. Popular English usage lumps single "free" morphemes and multiple morpheme utterances as words. Most linguists feel the term should not be used at all; others believe that the "word" must be redefined for a particular language. In its popular meaning, the term fails both as a linguistic and a psychological unit. A few linguists use the "word" as a general linguistic unit, but they redefine it in special ways (e.g., Bloomfield 1933: 178; Greenberg, Osgood, and Sebeok 1954: 66–67).

The sentence is another unit of popular usage thought by many to be present in all languages as a significant unit and thus to have "psychological reality." In English and some other languages, the sentence is marked off by final juncture and a characteristic intonation pattern. Many languages have no such markers, however, and it is not possible to find sentence units which can serve as useful linguistic categories. Even in English it is not always possible to segment a flow of rapid conversational speech into sentences. It is very probable, therefore, that writing has made English and other languages with a literate tradition divisible into such units as sentences, clauses, and phrases. Certainly these units do not have universal representation among languages.

Of the analytic units used in descriptive linguistics, only the phoneme and morpheme appear to have some probability of being matched by perceptual categories. But even with these categories there have been no valid tests to demonstrate comparability with perceptive units. A number of research proposals were made by a seminar in psycholinguistics which was held in conjunction with the Linguistic Institute at Indiana University during the 1953 summer session. The following proposals for experimentation made by this seminar (Osgood and Sebeok 1954:63–64) are especially intriguing:

It was suggested, for example, that child language might be observed to determine whether children learned monosyllabic items on the basis of the syllable or a phonemic basis. Thus, if it turned out that a child learned a series of single syllables, no two of which formed a minimal contrast, then one might conclude that learning was on a syllable basis rather than a phonemic basis. For example, if a child learned the word "pa," he did not then learn "ma," but first learned "me."

On the morphological level the seminar suggested that careful observation of child language might be made whether multimorpheme words were learned as units or were segmented into morpheme components. For example, some children apparently confuse the terms "yesterday" and "tomorrow" indicating that these utterances are considered minimal units of meaning. On the other hand, other child language observations reveal that some children are aware of morphemes and make a formation such as "monk" from "monkey" in analogy to a pair like "dog-doggie." In other words, "key" and "gie" /kiy, giy/ are considered allomorphs of a morpheme meaning diminutive, while "dog" and "monk" are designations for animals.

Another suggestion made by the 1953 seminar was the use of reversed speech in controlled experiments (Osgood and Sebeok 1954:64–65). The object is to determine the points where mistakes are made in order to find out the units into which a speaker divides speech. Thus, subjects might be asked to reverse the words "boys" /boyz/ and "noise" /noyz/. The /z/ is linguistically different in these two cases. In "boys" two morphemes are involved represented by the /z/; in the second, the utterance is a single morpheme. Further, the morpheme for plural /z/ has an allomorph /s/. One might, therefore, expect "soyb" [rather than "zoyb"] for "boys" in reverse speech. Such a response would indicate an awareness of phonemes and allophonic variations. In the case of reversing "noise" one ought to get a consistent response of /zoyn/ since linguistically there is no conflict between /s/ and /z/ in this term.

Reversal speech experiments are beset by a number of problems. The influence of orthography is perhaps the primary difficulty, but another is the emphasis laid in language studies on syllabic analysis. It would, therefore, be imperative to use illiterate subjects or preschool children in these experiments.

No experiments have been conducted to establish conclusively that linguistic units are psychologically valid. In 1955 and 1956 the Southwestern Project on Psycholinguistics carried out significant research among American Indian groups in New Mexico and Arizona, but none of these specifically tested the problem of psycholinguistic units. Thus, the suggestion that the phoneme and morpheme may correlate with perceptive units remains an intriguing hypothesis.

Actually we know very little about psychological processes in language learning. It is possible that linguistic units and corresponding psychological categories may not be the same in all languages. Thus, language learning may be in terms of morphemic units in one language and by "words" of popular usage in another. The recent work of some anthropologists in cognition (See Conklin 1962; Frake 1962; and Wallace 1962) indicates that there are radical differences in the conceptual categories used by diverse peoples. Linguistic units and perceptual units might have to be matched in each language, rather than across languages.

Orthography in written languages also undoubtedly affects perceptual processes in language learning. The units by which people in nonliterate languages make linguistic responses may differ radically from those who have a written tradition.

Language learning also involves the consideration of the sociocultural factors in which language patterns are embedded and the historical circumstances surrounding the language community. Adverse or permissive contact situations will affect the ease and/or difficulty with which a group learns the language of a politically dominant group despite the structural and semantic characteristics of the contacting languages. A receptive people like the Yaqui of Sonora, for example, are likely to respond to a contacting group and language in quite a different manner than a resistant group like the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico (Dozier 1956; Spicer 1943).

Linguistic techniques are helpful, but not a cure-all. Theoretical linguists are seeking more precise and economical ways to describe language systems. For the most part, they are not working to solve the problems of language teaching and learning. The educational specialist must, himself, find out what the linguist has to offer; he cannot expect the linguist to provide answers and solutions to the problems of language learning and teaching.

References

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933.

Conklin, Harold C. ''Lexicographical Treatment of Folk Taxonomies,'' *Problems in Lexicography,* eds. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta. Supplement to *International Journal of American Linguistics,* 28, 2. Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, Publication 21. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.

Frake, Charles O. ''The Ethnographic Study of Cognitive Systems,'' *Anthropology and Human Behavior,* eds. Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant. Washington: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1962.

Dozier, Edward P. ''Two Examples of Linguistic Acculturation,'' *Language,* 32 (1956), 146–157.

Osgood, Charles E., and Thomas A. Sebeok. ''Psycholinguistics, a Survey of Theory and Research Problems,'' Supplement to the *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology,* 49, 4, pt. 2. Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc., 1954.

Spicer, Edward H. ''Linguistic Aspects of Yaqui Acculturation,'' *American Anthropologist,* 45 (1943), 410–426.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. ''Culture and Cognition,'' *Science,* 135 (1962), 351–357.

First- and Second-Language Learning

Lois McIntosh

No matter which language we learned first, or where we learned it, all of us have acquired our mother tongue in much the same way. We began with unstructured noises very early in life. Nobody taught us to coo, babble, and cry—but as infants we began to practice these sounds and as many more as we could manage. In that prelanguage period we probably produced some speech sounds that we never made again once real speech had overtaken us.

Nelson Brooks points out that the baby is a very active participant in the process of language learning.[1] His experiments with sound lead to his finding some that convey meaning, and then he is on his way to produce sounds that will deal with the environment he knows. Meanwhile, he is surrounded by adults who respond to his efforts with the systematic language of the community. He shapes his efforts more and more their way and finally breaks through into "real speech."

Studies of infant performance vary in results, but some observers have suggested that by the time the baby is four weeks old, he turns his head and heeds sounds. At sixteen weeks, cooing, babbling, chuckling, laughing, and reaction to the human voice are noticeable. By twenty-eight weeks his crows and squeals signal evident understanding of what is said to him. By the end of the first year he listens intently to words, understands commands, and has a repertory of one or several one-word sentences.

For about six months after that his repertory may be limited to fewer than sixty words, but they are used incessantly. At eighteen months, there is a sudden spurt, and he perceives whole units and applies his one-word sentences to varying situations.

Once the child has succeeded in producing speech to communicate with others, his development is largely determined by the people around him. Over and over in his home, with his doting relatives, with his own friends, he uses language, hears more of it, tries it out, is corrected or not, talks to himself by the hour. Brooks points out that the oral production of children is prodigious. Although it varies from individual to individual, some four-year-olds have been found to produce over a thousand words an hour, with 400 an hour probably average for this age. Brooks says that it is not unusual to find a five-year-old child using 10,000 or 15,000 words per day. "What this means in terms of practice of a skill is highly significant for the older learner of a second language."[2]

In five or six years with hours of practice, great motivation, instant rewards for success, the child acquires his first language, though not quite completely. Later years, school years, complete a process that has been well begun.

How differently we learn a second language. While most human beings acquire their first language in much the same way, the circumstances and success of the second language cannot be predicted so readily.

Learning a second language is a process that varies widely according to the age of the learner, his opportunities, his motivation. But there is one learner of immediate concern to us here. He is the young child who enters elementary school and immediately plunges into English. At home he speaks Spanish or Japanese or Greek or Navajo, and he carries on his life in terms of his first language.

He is young enough to "pick up" another language fairly easily. He is not inhibited as an older learner might be, and in play with speakers of other languages, he will absorb enough to be part of the game. However, he is not a clean slate on which English can be written. In his first contacts with English he hears Spanish, or Japanese, or any other first language. In his first attempts to speak, he substitutes for English those sounds so much a part of him that he is unconscious of having mastered them. His time to practice is limited. He may have only an hour or two a day to wrestle with this new language, where formerly he had all day every day to acquire the first one. His motivation may not be as high. He was fiercely determined to speak with others in his first language. He doesn't really need this second language—when he goes home, his Spanish will serve him well, and many of his school friends speak Spanish too. The demands of the school make him pay some attention to English, but probably not enough.

---

[1] Nelson Brooks, *Language and Language Learning* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960), p. 35.

[2] Brooks, p. 39.

Since learning a language means acquiring a skill, the second language learner must begin where the first language learner did. He must learn to hear and discriminate among the sounds of this new language. He must learn to produce by imitation the sentences his teacher models for him. He must have opportunities to repeat many times the sounds and sentences until his control is automatic.

He must be led systematically through the new language, a little at a time. If his lessons are organized in such a way that what he learns on Monday will lead to what he will learn on Tuesday, he will be fortunate. If this teacher speaks both his first and his second language, he is fortunate too. Not that his teacher will want to translate everything into the learner's mother tongue. But she will know what his problems are going to be when he transfers his habits over to the new language. If she doesn't speak his language, the more she knows about it and the way it contrasts with English, the more helpful she can be.

This young learner does not have six years of full-time practice on the new language. He does have interference from his first language. He must practice again and again the sounds and sequences of English until he hears them instead of Spanish, and produces them instead of Spanish with a light touch of reasonably approximated English. The spoken language is primary, and until he has learned to control some of the basic sentences so that he uses them automatically, his lessons should focus on aural-oral activities. The usual procedure is (1) to listen, (2) to imitate, (3) to produce with less imitation. Later, reading and writing activities may come in, but when they do, it is hoped that the learner will be asked first to read and write those sentences he has already learned to say.

The adult learner of a second language should follow many of the same steps that the child did. It is harder for him to do this, for he has had more years to make his first language firmly his. He is strongly influenced by his reading and writing skills, and he sometimes feels that if he can't see what he is saying he isn't really saying it.

But the adult learner must take the same steps that the child does. He must learn to hear and discriminate between the rhythms and intonations and significant sounds of the new language. He must learn to produce sounds that are completely new to him and sounds that are difficult for him to hear because they were not significant in his first language. Because he is fluent and able in his first language, he feels awkward and inhibited in the second with its limited sentences and restricted vocabulary in the early stages. The need for repetition, for constant practice, must be made evident to him.

Procedures and lesson details will vary with the age and situation of the learner. The adult may arrive at the reading and writing stage sooner than the child. The content of his sentences may be more suitable to his age and interests, but the structures may be the same as those the child is learning.

It is not necessary for both a six-year-old and a thirty-year-old to begin with "This is a cat." But it is necessary for both of them to acquire the sentence:

This is a . . . .

Both learners are at the beginning stage of language learning. Beyond that stage lie two more levels of achievement. An intermediate stage arrives in which the student has acquired control of most of the essential signals of the language, but he is not yet fluent or completely accurate. At the intermediate level, he turns his attention more to reading and writing the new language. The strict controls on vocabulary of his elementary days give way to more emphasis on increasing his store of words. The final stage, the stage of the advanced learner, brings the student, whether he is six or sixty, to near-native ability in the language. He should be able to keep up in class with students who have spoken the language all their lives. He will probably be a better speller than they, but his spoken language will continue to show traces of his first language influences.

For those of us who are native speakers teaching our language to others, a word of caution. We have lived with our language for a long time, and we take it very much for granted. In the early stages of dealing with it as a language foreign to others, we encounter pitfalls. Just how should we model our sentences? What English shall we teach? Suppose your speech has a strong regional flavor—should you teach your accent to the students? Why not? They are of the region, too, and if they speak another dialect, they may be laughed at. Besides, more practically, how long can you consistently model a speech not naturally your own?

We will, of course, try to teach an acceptable standard of English so that the student will be equipped to cope with a society that is highly critical of language performance. Like many native speakers, he may not always use his standard English among his peers, but he needs to be equipped with the ability to use it when he must. And we must see to it that he is thus equipped.

I have come rather a long way from the infant in the cradle, struggling to join the speech community, and it is time to draw things together.

We acquire our first, our mother tongue, in the time and through the processes I have described; and forever after, it is with us. We acquire a second language depending on our age, our needs, and the opportunities to learn it and to use it. It is harder to learn because the first language is in the way, but learn it people do.

References

Brooks, Nelson. *Language and Language Learning.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960.

Hemphill, Roderick (ed). *Background Readings in Language Teaching.* Monograph One, Philippine Center for Language Study, 1961.

Saporta, Sol (ed.). *Psycholinguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
1) Berko, Jean. ''The Child's Learning of English Morphology,'' pp. 359–375.
2) Carroll, John B. ''Language Development in Children,'' pp. 331–345.
3) Leopold, Werner F. ''Patterning in Children's Leaning,'' pp. 350–358.

Bilingualism as a Goal of Foreign Language Teaching

Einar Haugen

Since the object of all teaching is that someone should learn, the goal of foreign language teaching is presumably that our students should learn the foreign language which we are teaching. But there are many ways of learning and many degrees of proficiency. It will be my purpose in this paper to examine the concept of bilingualism and ask how it relates to language learning and language teaching.

The popular concept of a bilingual is that which is formulated for example in the latest Webster's International: "a person using two languages esp. habitually and with a control like that of a native speaker." I don't know precisely what reservations are intended by that "esp.," but it suggests that the authors will settle for a good deal less than native control.

Let us limit our idea of bilingualism to oral fluency, and grant bilingual status to anyone who can speak about everyday things with normal speed and comprehension, understanding and being understood, in two or more languages. It will be our purpose to explore how people arrive at this goal and what happens to them during this process.

Every person learns one language in early childhood as a part of his social heritage. He may become bilingual either in the preschool period, during his school years, during his adolescence, or in adulthood. We all know from experience that the process seems to be the more painless and successful the earlier it takes place. Puberty seems to be a psychological and sociological threshold, especially for the acquisition of a perfect accent. The imitative power is reduced along with the consolidation of the child's personality and its emergence as a fully shaped individual. All later language learning carries with it a return to the dependency relation of childhood, which many find either impossible or distasteful. One can say with some confidence that unless ye become as little children, ye will never learn a foreign language. It is extremely difficult to get students to drop the barriers of shame that inhibit their willingness to imitate strange sounds and think in strange ways.

But if we explore these inhibitions a little more deeply, we find that learning a foreign language can be a traumatic experience in ways that we often do not wholly wish to face. In order to make this clear, let me make some digressions into the nature of linguistic structure and the problem of peaceful coexistence.

The development of linguistic science has made it abundantly clear that the items which enter into a language—its sounds, its words, its grammatical patterns, and its meanings—are not discrete items, merely coexisting in the mind, but are associated with one another into tight structures. I shall grant immediately, and even insist, that the term "structure" is a metaphor, drawn from the prevailing scientific thinking of our time, just as the nineteenth century drew the term "organism" from the biological thinking of its time. Whether we say that language is an organism or a structure, however, we are still saying that its parts are proportioned to one another, and that no one part can really function except in relation to all the rest. We use the term "structure" simply because the emergence of *Gestalt* theory in psychology has given us the concept that the whole can be greater than its parts, a concept that turns out to be fruitful in thinking of language also.

The child who learns a language is very far from being a memory machine that registers and remembers utterances and then spouts them back at appropriate intervals.

The miracle of human learning is most clearly reflected in the child who says "I goed" or "I sawed" instead of "I went" or "I saw" because he can apply to new verbs the rule he has established by his observation of forms like "I rowed" or "I stayed." His rules may be incomplete, as in this case, but his performance tells us that he knows them, and for the most part they do lead to acceptable results. No one has told him about these rules or even that there are such rules. He makes his own grammar, a fantastically ingenious computer program for processing the utterances he hears and for generating new responses that he has never heard before.

Psychologists, often working in cooperation with linguists, have been exploring the psychological mechanisms involved in setting up these grammatical structures. The work of Roger Brown may be mentioned as especially stimulating. At the same time anthropologists and social psychologists have been exploring the social mechanisms that determine the individual's response to linguistic structures and that determine this preference for one language over another. The main problem is that we can find no evidence that languages are stored in separate compartments of the brain. All the languages one learns have to coexist in the same language center. Yet successful bilingualism requires that they be organized into separate circuits. Switching from one language to another is like pressing a button, or a switch if you will, so that now one set of items and rules is uniquely accessible and a moment later an entirely different set is accessible. There have to be two independent hookups for these two structures. If there is overlapping, the result is interference, which manifests itself in the well-known phenomena of foreign accent, erroneous grammatical and syntactical constructions, word borrowing, calques and loanshifts of all kinds. The fact that such phenomena are well known and are frequently observed in the speech of bilinguals is evidence that even the best of bilinguals are hard put to it to maintain two separate structures, and that real effort has to go into the clean separation of the two hookups in the brain. If we make our demands sufficiently strict, we shall probably find that there are no perfect bilinguals.

In the near-perfect bilingual the two structures are as near independent as possible; psychologists have been referring to them as coordinate. To the extent that they overlap they have been called compound. This distinction between coordinate bilinguals and compound bilinguals has proved to be useful in psychological experimentation, as reported especially by Osgood, Ervin, and Lambert.[1] For details I refer you to Lambert's recent article in the *Modern Language Journal*. The coordinate bilingual has been shown to have two distinct sets of associations with words referring to the same outward objects; the English "church" would not have the same ultimate meaning to him as French "église." The compound bilingual associates the two, probably because he learned one of them through the other, and anything he knows about one he applies equally to the other. In popular terminology, the compound bilingual thinks in one language and translates into the other, while the coordinate bilingual thinks in whichever language he is using at the moment. More precisely, the compound bilingual has two fused systems, while the coordinate has two discrete ones. The distinction is not absolute; a great many speakers actually have a system and a half, partly compound and partly coordinate. But the experience of aphasics shows that the coordinate bilingual may lose one of his languages without its affecting the other, while compound bilinguals are equally affected in both.[2]

Let us now return to the problem of establishing bilingualism. How does the individual, especially if he is already adult, ever attain this level? We all recognize that the only perfect way is to transport him into an environment where the language he wants to learn is in full active use. Nowadays there are many opportunities for travel abroad which make this possible. We are doing what we can to simulate this situation by intensive courses, summer camps, and the like for those who lack the opportunity to live abroad. What is it we are trying to do in this case, and how important is it as a goal of language learning? What are the effects on the learners?

---

[1] Susan Ervin and C.E. Osgood, "Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Supplement to 49 (1954), 139–146; Wallace E. Lambert, "Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language," *Modern Language Journal*, 47 (1963), 51–62, 114–121.

[2] W. E. Lambert and S. Fillenbaum, "A Pilot Study of Aphasia among Bilinguals," *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13 (1959), 28–34.

We may safely dismiss those studies which have tried to demonstrate that bilingualism is an intellectual handicap. These results have invariably been attained by means of verbal intelligence tests. They have generally been administered to pupils who have learned one language at home and are being taught in a school system which uses a different language. That they have a verbal handicap when compared with pupils who have learned the same language both at home and in school merely demonstrates that it takes time and effort to learn a language. Other things being equal, one who devotes twice as much time as another to learning a subject should do rather better at it. Even if there is some verbal handicap, the level attained may still be perfectly adequate, and the learner has the total satisfaction of being acceptable in both cultures: that of his home and that of his school. Lambert has clearly shown that when the true bilinguals are separated out from the partial ones, their performance (at least in the schools of Montreal) is far superior to that of monolinguals, even on the verbal tests.

There is a subtler and possibly more insidious problem which faces the true or coordinate bilingual. We may call this the problem of identity. To understand it we must think a moment about the goals of language learning. Many who advocate the learning of languages emphasize their value as tools. Language is a key that unlocks the treasures of other cultures, whether we are thinking of science, literature, or the arts. This view has been called the "instrumental" view of language. I would say, for example, that the learning of Latin for the sake of understanding English better is a prime example of such language learning. Greek and German obviously come to mind as aids in our understanding of some areas of science and philosophy, even when we confine ourselves to English. The instrumental approach offers the learner little more than an extension of his own language. The Japanese who learns even a smattering of English is thereby enabled to understand and pronounce a little more accurately the numerous English terms that have been embedded in his language. Language for the cultured man is essentially an instrumental view. For such learners, a compound or fused knowledge of the foreign language is entirely adequate. From the start, one associates the foreign term with its native equivalent or is made aware that there is no equivalent. At every step, the foreign item or pattern is seen in the light of the learner's native language and thereby becomes for him an experience in cultural anthropology. But no matter how refined the process and how high the culture, it is still an instrumental approach.

Coordinate bilingualism has been called "integrative" in contrast with the "instrumental" view. I should call it a problem in identification. This is due ultimately to the fact that language is more than a tool. A tool is something external, something one can use when needed and throw away when it is not wanted. It is hard to find the best metaphor to use for this other, integrative aspect of language. Perhaps we can best approach it by calling it an activity. Language is not just something we know and make use of. It is something we do. In doing it we are performing, playing a role which is a part of ourselves. It gives expression to our identity, or in the case of a bilingual, to a part of his identity. The coordinate bilingual can be said in this sense to have a dual identity.

The evidences for this view are accumulating in the studies of scholars. One of these concerns the motivation of successful language learners. Test after test has shown that language learning is only partly correlated with intelligence or language aptitude. W. R. Jones showed that in Wales the learning of Welsh was closely correlated to a fondness for the Welsh and a sympathetic orientation toward their way of life.[3] In French Canada Lambert has found by repeated tests that students who are well-disposed toward French Canadians learn French noticeably better than those who are not.[4] But the effects go beyond a successful acquisition of the language. They lead to an adoption of the cultural habits of the other language group and even of their points of view. Tests made of students in intensive courses in French at McGill University showed considerable increases in social alienation from their native environment, a state which psychologists describe under the term "anomie."[5]

I do not think we should be unduly alarmed at this finding. Perhaps a bit of anomie is a good thing. It is certainly a well-known aspect of the process of immigration. A recent study by Herman in Israel has traced the profile of experiences by immigrants to that country who have had to learn Hebrew in order to integrate themselves into its modern life.[6] He found them going through five typical stages: (1) a period of anticipation, which often includes preparation by taking courses in Hebrew; (2) a period of initial conformity, when the speaker does his utmost to learn Hebrew and to use it on all occasions; (3) a period of discouragement, when the limitations of his language knowledge become apparent, and he is no longer treated with indulgence; (4) a period of crisis, when he realizes that he is losing his old personality and has not yet acquired an adequate new one; he tends to return to the use of English and seek out the company of English speakers; (5) a period of adjustment and integration, when he has learned to accept his special status as an immigrant and he uses the two languages as the situation demands. This profile is that which has been characteristic of a great part of America's many millions of immigrants, and which even today can be seen at work for example among foreign students at our universities who stay for more than a very short period.

That this is so follows from the differences among languages in the way they organize the universe. Those of us who have had extensive experience as coordinate bilinguals know only too well how many subtle differences there are in the way different language communities express themselves. We know that no matter which of our languages we use, there is a whole area of our personalities that is locked away in the other. We feel a sympathy for the kind of views expressed by Edward Sapir when he wrote that "the worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached."[7] There is today a whole literature on the subject of the so-called Whorfian hypothesis, which makes the same point in an exaggerated form. Fortunately, even the most different languages have in common certain universals that guarantee them as human and that reassure us of man's common humanity.

We are now ready, I think, to draw together the threads of our argument and consider bilingualism as a goal of language teaching. The difference between compound and coordinate bilingualism reaches down into fundamental springs of human personality and corresponds to differing functions of language. In compound bilingualism there is one linguistic structure, which has been enriched by the addition of elements from other languages. There is one human personality, expressing itself through a single medium of great complexity. Even though the user of the foreign language may achieve considerable fluency, it is never anything but a tool of his monolithic identity. In coordinate bilingualism there are two linguistic structures, each functioning as the expression of an identity of its own. These identities may differ very little thanks to cross-cultural ties which integrate the two languages into one experience. But in establishing the two structures, the speaker is forced to isolate them and keep them apart if he does not wish to be constantly offending against the phonological, grammatical, and lexical rules of the new language. He is in part deprived of his previous experience in the other language and must make do with what is available in the new one. If this is inadequate and seems poverty-stricken, he feels dumb and frustrated and begins to suffer from anomie. His identity is at stake, and he may find himself unable to choose between going on into the new culture and becoming a new man, or retreating into the old and remaining his old self.

---

[3] W. R. Jones, "Attitude towards Welsh as a Second Language," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 19 (1949), 44–52, and 10 (1950), 117–132.

[4] R. C. Gardner and W. E. Lambert, "Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition," *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13 (1959), 266–272.

[5] W. E. Lambert, R. C. Gardner, H. C. Barik, and K. Tunstall, "Attitudinal and Cognitive Aspects of Intensive Study of a Second Language," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66 (1963), 358–368.

[6] Simon N. Herman, "Explorations in the Social Psychology of Language Choice," *Human Relations*, 14 (1961), 149–163.

[7] E. Sapir, "The Status of Linguistics as a Science," *Language*, 5 (1929), 207–214.

In San Francisco they tell the story of a girl from that city who married a Frenchman and now lives in Paris. I quote the story from the *San Francisco Chronicle*: "Like most American girls, she was more concerned with acquiring an authentic accent than in developing a vocabulary—and in this she has been successful: she pronounces the few words she knows perfectly, with the result that the French no longer take her for an American. They think she's a rather stupid Frenchwoman."

Let this be our concluding text. Coordinate bilingualism can be established only at the cost of a self-suppression and identification that may involve deep humiliation. In attempting to establish it in our students we may be attacking the very core of their personalities. The role of pronunciation is here a critical one. While we strive for a perfect pronunciation, we should not overdo it. To lose one's accent is to identify completely with another society and another way of life. It means losing one's status as a foreign speaker and therefore all tolerance of one's errors in other respects. A foreign accent is the foreigner's best passport and the last bastion of his original identity. The foreigner who has acquired a perfect accent is saying that not only has he become as a little child, but he has been born again.

Applications of Reinforcement Learning Theory to Second-Language Learning

Ruth Roberts

The summer of 1964 marks the eleventh anniversary of the launching of psycholinguistics as a productive science. (Osgood and Sebeok, 1954) The published papers of that Indiana University summer seminar clearly indicate that the representatives of both parent disciples had a wealth of information and pertinent methodology to bring to bear on a second-language learning, but they lacked a common scientific language to discuss their common problems. In a real sense in 1953, psychologists and linguists were talking "at" rather than "with" one another.

For most of us attending these meetings in Tucson, the most heartening result of the 1953 conference is the fact that the scientists in linguistics and psychology are now working together and communicating effectively. When, then, may we expect the scientists to start communicating with those of us in the applied field of teaching English to speakers of other languages?

If, by communicating, we mean writing textbooks and preparing tapes and other practice materials for us, the answer is and probably should be, "never." However, if we mean using the scientists effectively as consultants in preparing texts, tapes, and programed materials, psycholinguistics has something to offer in spite of its tender age, and has, in fact, already made a contribution in the form of programed instruction applied to second-language learning materials, mainly for native English speakers.

To make the limited accomplishments and the problems of psycholinguistics meaningful, I shall briefly review two reinforcement theories of learning, summarize some of the recent research on first- and second-language learning, and then discuss selected findings and experimental techniques which you may find useful in presenting the material of English as a second language to intermediate and advanced students.

Reinforcement Theories of Learning

The first real breakthrough or discovery which provided a model for the study of learning under controlled laboratory conditions was Pavlov's conditioned reflex experiment, familiar to all who have taken an introductory psychology course, through an illustration of a dog conditioned to salivate to the sound of a tone. In oversimplified form, this principle can be stated as follows: if you pair a neutral stimulus (the tone) with an eliciting stimulus (food) over a few practice trials, the previously neutral stimulus will evoke the same sort of response (salivation) previously associated only with the sight or smell of food. Pavlov referred to the role of food in this experiment as "reinforcing," a term or concept still regarded as necessary in most current versions of learning theory. Older textbooks call this type of learning, classical conditioning, while current books usually prefer the more descriptive term, respondent conditioning.

Pavlov's experiment did not involve human beings, and nothing resembling verbal learning was involved. To use this respondent conditioning model, most American psychologists believe that it is necessary to identify a specific stimulus for which the human being or lower animal possesses a special receptor. It is most useful as a model when the behavior or reaction involves glandular and smooth muscle activity and the reinforcement satisfies a basic or primary need closely tied to the survival of the individual or of the species.

Most human behavior, including verbal learning, either does not fit the conditions of Pavlov's model, or we do not have sufficient knowledge to understand the connection. The most popular theoretical model for both experimental research and applied work on human verbal learning is called "operant" or "instrumental" conditioning. Because operant conditioning is the theoretical position taken by B. F. Skinner, it is on this basis that he demonstrated that at least one learning theory could be applied to human verbal learning in the form of teaching machines or programed instruction. (Keller, 1954 and Skinner, 1953).

In the operant situation, we start with an already learned response or behavior which either leads to a reinforcing stimulus or has done so at some time in the past. Environmental stimuli become attached to this behavior and can serve to encourage or discourage its repetition. The permanency of the learning can be effectively governed by the schedule (frequency and regularity) of reinforcement; e.g., responses followed irregularly by a reinforcer tend to be retained longer than those responses which are constantly reinforced.

The other side of the coin in terms of the operant conditioning model is extinction, unlearning or eliminating a wrong or interfering but previously learned response. If a conditioned response or bit of behavior is not reinforced, that response will cease or be extinguished. Eventually, however, this extinguished response will recover.

Assuming that this operant conditioning model can be applied to second-language learning, we can temporarily extinguish the interfering elements of the native language by failing to reinforce or respond to them while establishing and reinforcing the new phonemes, vocabulary, and structural patterns of the new language. Ideally, our students would room with native English speakers, and no other speaker of a student's native language would be included in the living unit.

Research on Language Learning

The nonsense syllable and techniques for studying retention and forgetting introduced by Ebbinghaus before the turn of the century are still in use. (Ebbinghaus, 1913) They are, in fact, the source of most of the information in textbooks and journals under the heading, "verbal learning." Applying laboratory techniques and experimental controls to anything resembling the normal flow of language is predominantly a phenomenon of the past decade. Within the last three years, use of strings of phonemes, structural cues, and structural constraints have become familiar, but still infrequent, subjects for psycholinguistic research.

The results of studies using trigrams and single words are probably most related to the teaching of the phonemes and the vocabulary of a new language. Underwood and Schulz (1960), while studying the effect of frequency of experience with consonant and nonsense syllables and words, discovered that pronunciability is a very accurate predictor of response learning when visual presentation is used. Martin and Schulz (1963) extended this finding to the primary input skill, listening. Using aurally presented paired-associate lists, these researchers found that learning was facilitated by the pronunciability of either the stimulus or response members of the pair, and that the facilitation was significantly greater for the response member. They also found that under the conditions of this experiment, a six-second interval between stimulus and response was more effective than a two-second interval.

A second aspect of learning which may be important in second language learning was studied by Hill and Wickens (1962). They found that multiple cues in the stimulus member, using paired-associate presentation, reduced the decrement in learning (forgetting) over time.

The third area of research in this category involves the transfer of training. (Postman, 1962) In learning pairs of two syllable adjectives, Postman found that greater associative interference (confusion and difficulty in remembering initial pairings) occurred when a previously learned or old stimulus-response pair was repaired or scrambled. Further research on this aspect of learning is needed, but these results have a possible parallel when a single native word and a second language word are paired and, later, when another word or a second meaning of a word in the new language is introduced.

Bilingual and Cross-Cultural Research

Using bilinguals from Germany, Thailand, and Spanish-speaking countries who were successful graduate students in the United States, Paul Kolers (1963) found that one-third of the responses to dictionary equivalents across the four languages were equivalent; that concrete, manipulable concepts or words actually do have more commonality of meaning or associations; and that there were no differences at this level of English language control between coordinate and compound bilinguals.

A second study dealing with languages across cultures (Rosenzweig, 1964) provided a comparison among French workmen, French students, American workmen, and American students using associations to equivalent words within the native language. The greatest separation was between French workmen and French students. French students responded more like American students than like their own countrymen from a less privileged socioeconomic class. The associations of French workmen, but not their American equivalents, gave superordinate words as associations, a response characteristic of children in both countries.

Verbal Learning Studies within Our Culture

Within our culture, Glanzer (1962) studied the effect of grammatical category of words when such words were used in rote learning and word association tasks. He found that differences in retention favored content words when a paired-associate method was used; there was no clear trend favoring either content or function words in number of associations; and function words were easier to remember than content words when the words were surrounded by minimal context clues.

A group working at Chapel Hill (Fillenbaum, Jones, and Rapport, 1963) studied the verbatim, V, and the form class, FC, predictability of words as a function of rate of deletion from a speech transcript. Deletions varied from ⅙ to ½ of the words using the "cloze" technique. They found that success in predicting both FC and V increased moderately with the decreasing frequency of deletions; that there are considerable differences in performance between grammatical classes for both FC and V, the differences being less for predicting FC; and that within a given grammatical class, there are still substantial differences among the items on both V and FC predictability. Possibly FC predictability is more dependent on the relatively close grammatical environment while V depends more on both close and remote content or semantic features of discourse.

Miller and Isard (1963) did one of the most imaginative studies to date on the perceptual consequences of linguistic rules. They built ten sets of materials, each containing five grammatical, five anomalous, and five ungrammatical or scrambled sentences using identical words throughout each set. Subjects then had to repeat what they heard under normal conditions, against a controlled but variable decibel level of masking noise, and with a preparatory set grouping or blocking the type of sentences. In spite of preliminary practice with equivalent materials, intelligibility improved with practice during the experiment for all three types of sentences. Under normal conditions, capacity to repeat scrambled sentences improved most with practice, while grammatical sentences, already at a good level, improved least.

With masking, anomalous sentences were far more accurately repeated than scrambled sentences, thus demonstrating the importance of syntactic rules in communication. Grammatical sentences could be repeated considerably better than the anomalous sentences in spite of the masking noise, so semantic rules also play an important role.

The results of some of these studies were known or assumed from the work of other disciplines, primarily anthropology and sociology. In other cases, the gap between theory and application is still too great or the experimental findings too conflicting to provide a basis for revising either the order or the methods of presenting the material of second language learning. At Minnesota we have been experimenting with two types of information from these laboratory studies. The first application involves the use of cuing to teach the culture-bound uses of common idiomatic expressions. (Raygor, Roberts, and Spensley, 1963) The second application involves enriching or compounding the stimulus condition using both input skills, reading and listening, simultaneously, fading or eliminating the reading cues; then forcing the student to read questions and write partial answers while listening. (Roberts, 1962) Perhaps by the time we meet again, more of the bridge between theory and application will be completed.

References

Ebbinghaus, H. *Memory: A Contribution to Experimental Psychology,* trans. H. A. Ruger and C. E. Bussenius. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913.

Fillenbaum, Samuel, Lyle V. Jones, and Amnon Rapport. ''The Predictability of Words and Their Grammatical Class as a Function of Rate of Deletion from a Speech Transcript,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1963, pp. 186–194.

Glanzer, Murray. ''Grammatical Category: A Rote Learning and Word Association Analysis,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1962, pp. 31–41.

Hill, Frances, and Dulos D. Wickens. ''The Effect of Stimulus Compounding in Paired-Associate Learning,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1962, pp. 144–151.

Keller, Fred S. *Learning Reinforcement Theory.* New York: Random House, 1954.

Kolers, Paul A. ''Interlingual Word Association,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1963, pp. 291–300.

Martin, Edwin, and Rudolph W. Schultz, ''Aural Paired-Associate Learning: Pronunciability and the Interval between Stimulus and Response,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1963, pp. 389–391.

Osgood, C. E., and T. A. Sebeok (eds.) ''Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems,'' *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology,* Supplement, 49, 4, pt. 2 (1954).

Postman, Leo. ''Transfer of Training as a Function of Experimental Paradigms and Degree of First List Learning,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1962, pp. 109–118.

Raygor, Alton L., Ruth Roberts, and Karen Spensley. *American Special Expressions Program,* 1963. Experimental edition, unpublished.

Roberts, Ruth. *Programed Reading and Listening Comprehension for Foreign Students,* 1962, University of Minnesota. Experimental edition, dittoed.

Rosenzweig, Mark R. ''Word Associations of French Workmen: Comparisons with Associations of French Students and American Workmen and Students,'' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1964, pp. 57–69.

Skinner, B. F. *Science and Human Behavior.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.

Underwood, Benton J., and Rudolph W. Schultz. *Meaningfulness and Verbal Learning.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1960.

Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults—The Audiolingual Approach

Stanley Levenson

Language is not something one talks about, but something one talks. It is not something one thinks about, but something one does. Therefore, it is best learned not by analysis, but analogy; not by pondering over it, but by practicing it.[1] This, in essence, is the audiolingual approach.

The audiolingual teacher from the start must establish a set of hand signals to cue his students to give various responses. These signals should be used from the very first day of class and should be consistent so that students feel secure when they are called upon to respond. Having an effective seating arrangement also helps considerably in utilizing the audiolingual approach. A good seating arrangement, used with much success in San Diego County and elsewhere, is the arrangement in which students face each other with a center aisle in between. This allows the teacher to move up and down the aisle while being in close contact with each student as well as allowing students to communicate more freely.

The audiolingual teacher to be effective usually moves around quite a bit. He listens to individuals, to groups of individuals, to rows of individuals. He is available to correct immediately any mistakes in pronunciation or intonation. His classes are well planned; he knows the materials; and he is aware of the fact that all new material must be presented and drilled in class before the material is assigned for homework purposes.

During the first part of the course students will concentrate on two important aspects of language learning—learning a new sound system and learning to use some basic grammatical patterns of the language.

To gain control of the new sound system, the class should memorize dialogues by imitating and repeating after a model and by working with the instructor in pronunciation drills. The teacher serves as the primary model, but it is recommended that additional models be provided on phonograph discs and tapes. The speech heard on the discs and tapes should be standard speech of educated native speakers of the language without conspicuous regional or class characteristics. Teachers should be sure that their students understand that the speech heard is spoken at normal speed, even though it may seem fast to them at first. The language of the dialogues should be authentic; that is, what native-speaking students of the same age or adult level might naturally say in equivalent circumstances.

In audiolingual classes, grammatical patterns of the language are learned through a variety of speaking drills. Students will learn to form correct speech habits by repeating these drills until they can do them at normal speed without hesitating or making a mistake.

Most audiolingual programs today are divided into unit sections. Each unit contains basic dialogue drills and their adaptations, and various kinds of structure drills. A few kinds will be mentioned here. The central focus in the *dialogue drill* is on a real situation which the student can understand, with which he can identify himself, and in which he can enjoy participating.

---

[1] California State Department of Education. *Suggestions for Teaching Foreign Languages by the Audiolingual Method. A Manual for Teachers.* Bulletin XXIX, 7 (July 1960).

The objective of the *dialogue adaptation* is to relate dialogue sentences and situations to the personal experiences of the students and to aid conversation. It consists of questions and answers that may be used as soon as the corresponding part of the basic dialogue has been reasonably well learned by the students. These questions and answers may be varied within the limits of the students' learned vocabulary and structure. Dialogue adaptation is not the place to introduce new vocabulary or structure. Its purpose is to reenter words and patterns in a different context and in more personal situations.

Structure drills are designed to drill certain basic grammatical patterns in the language in terms of the language itself. The essence of these drills is the presentation of a frame utterance exemplifying a particular grammatical point, and the manipulation of it in such a way that the items illustrating this point are varied without changing the essential structure of the sentence. In this way the student's attention is drawn toward a slot in which the changes are being made; he learns to properly manipulate the items that can be substituted in that slot and gradually develops an awareness of the pattern he is handling.

An example of one kind of structure drill is a *repetition drill.* The forms are presented by a list of frames all based on a line taken from the basic dialogue. The change brought about by the succeeding utterances is minimal—it involves only one new grammar point being drilled. The drilling should be intensive and extensive enough so that the students will have sufficient control of the grammar point to be learned to be able to proceed to the next drill, which is called a *substitution drill.*

A substitution drill has three parts: a frame, a cue, and a response. The first is a model utterance the student repeats to begin the drill. He is then given a cue—that is, an element to be substituted in a certain slot in the frame. Combining the cue with the model utterance, he makes a second utterance, and so on for the drill. Each utterance would be reinforced with the correct response by the model.

Through drills such as these, the student takes part in two activities fundamental to the learning of any language: imitation and repetition. First, there must be good models to imitate; second, there must be opportunity to repeat frequently. The audiolingual approach, used by competent, enthusiastic teachers, can result in providing our students with the tools they need in coping with the problems of oral communication in our modern American society.

(Editorial Note: The original paper is obtainable by request from *the author* by enclosing a stamped self-addressed envelope.)

Bibliography

California State Department of Education, *Language Instruction Perspective and Prospectus.* Bulletin XXXII, 4 (November 1963).

———. *Suggestions for Teaching Foreign Languages by the Audiolingual Method.* Bulletin XXIX, 7 (July 1960).

Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1943.

Levenson, Stanley. "FLES Is a Revolution," *CTA Journal*, October 1963, pp. 16–18.

Modern Language Materials Development Center. *A-M Spanish Level One* (Student Textbook and Teacher's Manual). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

San Diego County Department of Education. *Materials for Teaching English as a Second Language.* Brief No. 64, April 1964.

Basic Considerations and Sequenced Steps in Teaching Young Children to Read English as a Second Language

Faye L. Bumpass

The average child who enters school speaking some language other than English is in no way ready to proceed toward reading development: he is faced first with the task of learning English as a second language. This does not mean that the non-native speaker of English must master the new language on a level equal to that of his English-speaking classmates before he can be introduced to reading, but it does mean that as soon as possible he should attain a minimal counterpart of their language.

Consequently, the effective teacher limits the selection of the experiences within the second language to matters that are basic to the language. They should include significant segments of sound and structure and an adequate number of lexical items that will aid the non-native speaker in learning to move more smoothly in the foreign-speaking environment. An aural-oral mastery of 500 words with a recognition of at least 75 more for use in the first reading program is usually considered minimum.

As requests, commands, simple questions and answers, and declarative sentences play an important part in the language of all young children when they first enter school, the teacher should give emphasis to the practice of patterns built on these types. In the first year of school, all kinds of interesting activities in a kind of play atmosphere can be utilized to help the children learn to "hear," "recognize," and "reproduce" all basic forms that they are going to need to use in their reading later.

What the teacher needs to remember is that young children learn best through meaningful activities on their level of understanding and that sequenced steps of progressive difficulty can insure more effective presentation and more rapid learning. Specifically, the pupils *listen* to the new utterance, associating meaning through the visual materials or dramatized action, as the teacher repeats it and demonstrates its meaning. Then the pupils *repeat* the new utterance, imitating both the teacher's voice and the up-and-down movement of his hand which coincides with the stress and pitch sequence in the pattern. Thus, they learn to associate sound with meaning as they begin to assimilate the pattern for future recall. Then the pupils *practice* the basic patterns day after day in interesting activities on their age and interest levels until they have mastered them.

When basic structural patterns and an adequate number of lexical items have been learned in automatic form, the pupils may be considered ready for the reading experience provided they have had initiatory reading readiness experience which may be checked by such criteria as the following:

1) Can they detect small differences in objects almost alike?
2) Do they enjoy looking at picture books, and are they curious about printed words?
3) Do they handle books carefully, and do they often ask what printed symbols say?
4) Can they repeat sentences of five or six words in the new language with fluency and correctness?
5) Can they give three or four sentences in sequence in monologue form in response to cued questions as a culminating activity of intensive oral practice?

6) Do they know a few of the Mother Goose rhymes in English, having experienced their meanings through translation or a simplification of concepts?

After having assessed the pupils' ability in oral English and in reading readiness as adequate for introducing the reading program, the teacher is faced with the problem of selecting appropriate materials and organizing them in logical and progressive sequence for class presentation.

The meaning-bearing sentence patterns selected for reading in any one period should be limited in number. Much oral reading practice, both in chorus and individually, should be used to aid the non-native speakers in correlating the oral language to the written forms. Silent reading may be introduced, but in the initial stages of the reading program, it should be an outgrowth of the oral reading practice.

The three essential stages for developing reading skill with non-native speakers should be as follows: (1) *Introductory Stage,* in which the teacher establishes the emotional climate for the reading experience by motivating interest and clarifying concept; (2) *Look and Say Stage,* in which the teacher presents the graphic symbols or printed forms for developing quick and accurate recognition; and (3) *Reading Stage,* in which the teacher affords all types of opportunities for reading practice and the development of reading skill.

In the Introductory Stage, establishing a definite situation for motivating interest and clarifying concepts for native speakers may require explanations in informal terms, since these pupils have a firm grasp on the oral language. However, with non-native speakers the teacher should use a more specifically organized procedure. His purpose is to give enough oral practice in this stage to clarify all concepts so that no doubt remains in the pupils' minds about the meaning of the sentences they are going to read.

He may follow the same sequenced steps of LISTEN, REPEAT, and PRACTICE, which he has used for the teaching the mastery of aural-oral forms in the prereading period. To motivate interest, the teacher should use a more rapid tempo in presentation and lead the pupils through a kind of choric reading practice based on simulated conversational practice.

Stimulated by an appropriate visual referent, the teacher may follow this procedure to attain effective results:

1) He holds up the visual referent around which the lesson narrative has been built and repeats the three or four sentences that the pupils will learn to read later.

2) Then he repeats the sentences one at a time, and he asks a cued question to elicit the full sentence response of each sentence that will form a part of the reading.

3) He leads the pupils to respond in chorus, and then individually, with this sentence from the reading, leads them to repeat the sentence pattern with correct pronunciation and intonation.

4) He continues this type of choric reading practice until all sentences of the lesson narrative have been repeated separately, and in their entirety, through this form of directed, simulated conversation.

As a culminating activtiy, the teacher may use a question cued to obtain all of the sentences in the narrative in response as a kind of monologue, choric reading response drill.

To present the graphic symbols or printed forms for recognition practice, the teacher follows the same sequential order as in the presentation outlined above, except that in this presentation, he shows the printed symbols (either on a flash card or by writing it on the blackboard) for visual recognition. Then he repeats the sentence containing the lexical item or concept being stressed and leads the pupils to repeat it also, associating the visual form with the auditory pattern and its meaning.

Since the accurate recognition of the visual forms is the most important skill to be developed in the initial stage of reading development, the teacher must use a variety of ways to help pupils learn to recognize the graphic symbols of each word being presented. The following are representative examples that may be used: by reference to configuration or general shape, by calling attention to some peculiarity about the word, or by using a context clue, such as allowing the pupils to supply the word when it is omitted from the sentence pattern.

Whatever technique the teacher may utilize in teaching word perception should be reinforced by having pupils SAY the word being presented as they LOOK at it carefully and apply it in the sentence patterns they will learn to read. If the teacher uses flash cards in this initial presentation, he may place them near the visual materials they explain and then have intensive, meaningful drill to elicit quick and accurate responses as the pupils associate the visual forms and vocal symbols to the pictured concepts. Such oral practice with pictured clues is an aid in helping pupils establish meaning associations as they "fix" in their memories the graphic forms.

Other activities such as the following may be used to advantage: flash card drills, finding words and framing them for the class to see and repeat, matching words to objects, and matching words to words. On the primary grade levels, flash card games create great interest and enthusiasm. By holding up the flash cards of words to be mastered visually, the teacher elicits the calling out of the word as he asks: "What word is this?" The child repeating the word correctly receives the flash card. The one who has the largest number of cards at the end of the practice is the winner of the game. The teacher must make sure that every child receives at least one card during the game.

Much oral practice through experiencing activities in the LOOK and SAY stage should be used, with emphasis on associating meanings to the graphic forms through pictured concepts. Pupils should be led to learn to recognize visual forms in automatic fashion, as the teacher works from the introduction of *the whole pattern*, drills on the separate parts, and then synthesizes the parts to form the whole again after intensive practice.

The next sequenced step, READ, begins with book reading practice. With books open, the pupils may be led through another choric reading practice, only this time they will be looking at the visual forms as they repeat the auditory patterns through which pupils may be aided in getting meaning from the printed page. In this initial choral reading, the teacher should correlate the narrative with visual referents, either with the visual aid illustration in the text or the one furnished by the teacher and placed on the chalk tray or in the wall chart.

If the children are in the primary grades, they should use markers, line by line, as they repeat in reading fashion each sentence of the lesson. After this oral practice, led by the teacher's voice, the pupils may be led to read the same sentences of the same narrative silently (with only their markers to guide them). With the intensive oral preparation indicated, even in the earliest stages of reading, the pupils may be able to get meaning from their materials just by reading silently.

Silent reading should be followed by oral reading by individuals, either of parts or of the whole of the lesson narrative. The teacher should take care that the reading aloud is done with correct pronunciation and intonation, and he should arrange for further oral drill, if errors are noted.

As a variation from reading the text, experience chart or blackboard reading may be utilized. Basic sentences from the reading lesson or from the pupils' daily experiences (which contain lexical items or basic patterns previously drilled on) may be written on the chart or blackboard in a kind of recombination narrative. Whatever the source of the sentences to be read, the practice in reading them chorally, silently, or orally by individuals will follow the same steps outlined previously. Before having individual members perform, the teacher should give directed choral reading practice and elicit choral unison response to cued questions. In this stage, reading development is largely oral and imitative, and it should always be teacher controlled.

During the reading and as culminating activities, the teacher should never hesitate to check on pupil comprehension. In this QUESTION and ANSWER practice, he needs to check to see if all pupils have a basic understanding of lexical items used within the sentence patterns. Through questions cued to elicit full sentence response answers, association drills on matching pictured concepts to visual forms, and other types of checking, he may insure pupil comprehension. He should not hesitate to provide for presentation again or further drill, if such is needed to establish correct linguistic habits or improve comprehension. He may use writing as a means of reinforcing the understanding of visual forms in a final stage of WRITE. Dictation as a kind of intonation practice is an excellent activity as pupils progress in the use of the new language.

As pupils progress into reading, clues for recognition of symbols should also change gradually from the use of gestures, pictures, labels, flash cards, blackboard and experience chart reading to intensive oral repetition of simple basic sentences taken from the longer sentences in the narrative. The mastery of these shorter structural forms may serve as contextual clues, as the pupils are led into further reading development.

By bearing in mind the following points, the teacher may be aided in his task of teaching reading in the second language:

1) Learning to read is a language-related process and necessitates much intensive oral practice on basic forms of sound and structure as a prerequisite to the introduction of reading.

2) Learning to read in the second language demands intensive repetition of lexical items within patterns with practice in associating meanings through visual referents as pupils correlate auditory patterns to written forms.

3) The introduction of reading to non-native speakers should lag somewhat behind the mastery of aural-oral skills and must deal with materials that the pupils are familiar with, adapted to their age and levels of interest.

4) The presentation of structural patterns for the reading experience must follow a carefully organized step-by-step progression with the initial activity of oral practice through the reading of text materials and experience charts.

5) Much oral reading is essential in building correct habits of pronunciation and intonation and in insuring mastery of oral forms for use in orienting the learner in terms of meaning as he learns to recognize the visual forms.

6) Silent reading must be introduced gradually and should be an outgrowth of oral practice in the beginning stages and reading development, but it may be utilized in reading unfamiliar materials as pupils progress in the development of this skill.

7) Testing on comprehension should be used after any drill or to check reading over small sequences in order to insure pupil comprehension of the various forms in the second language.

8) In later stages of reading, recombination narratives and longer passages should be read provided that intensive oral drills of basic structural patterns be given to form contextual clues in reading the longer sentences.

9) The learning to read in a second language means that pupils are learning to "perform" linguistically, and thus they must develop habits that are accurate and will lead the pupils into quick and immediate recognition responses to visual forms and their meanings.

Through the use of effective techniques and appropriate materials, the teacher of reading in the second language can help non-native speakers of English in our schools to become happier children in today's classrooms and more valuable citizens in the world of tomorrow.

Selected References

Bumpass, Faye L. *Teaching Young Students English as a Foreign Language.* New York: American Book Company, 1963.

Fries, Charles C. *Linguistics and Reading.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Lado, Robert. *Language Teaching.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Lefevre, Carl A. *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Philippine Center for Language Study Monograph Series. Quezón City: Phoenix Publishing House, 1964.

- Number 1: *Background Readings in Language Teaching* (Ed. R. J. Hemphill).
- Number 3: *Techniques and Procedures in Second Language Learning* (Fe. R. Decanay, Member, Writers' Team. Ed. J. Donald Bowen).

An Instructional Program for Spanish-Speaking Elementary School Pupils

Paul W. Bell

Perhaps the first step in trying to outline an adequate instructional program for the Spanish-speaking pupil is to recognize some pertinent facts about him. He comes into our schools with almost complete control of the sound system and structure of his vernacular, and with command of sufficient vocabulary to enable him to describe his experiences and express his needs. This does not mean that the Spanish-speaking first grade pupil speaks Spanish as it is prescribed by the Royal Academy, nor does it mean that he speaks the language of educated adults. It merely means that he has control of a highly complex system of verbalization which is sufficient for communication within the social environment in which he lives. In addition to his control of the language, he also has a well-developed set of concepts which have evolved as the result of his experiences, although these experiences and concepts may be quite different from those expected of native English-speaking children.

An adequate instructional program for Spanish-speaking children must provide for two quite distinct groups. The largest group is made up of childen who have never been to school in a Spanish-speaking country. These are the pupils who come into our schools for the first time not knowing how to speak English and not knowing how to read or write Spanish. Most of the children in this category are first grade pupils who, even though very often born in the United States, have not learned English in their Spanish-speaking homes and neighborhoods.

The instructional program for these pupils must be designed to produce two educational outcomes. First, the children must rapidly and efficiently learn to understand and speak English. And, almost simultaneously, they must learn how to read and write in this their second language. This is the monumental task which faces these six- and seven-year-olds on entering school.

In order to facilitate the pupils' rapid learning of English, we should group these pupils according to their proficiency in that language. If there is a large enough number of non-English-speaking children of approximately the same age in a school, it is best to group them as a self-contained class. If there are too few, it would be advisable to have them cluster-grouped in one classroom. Elementary school teachers have long recognized the need for grouping in reading, in arithmetic, and in other content areas, to meet individual differences. We must recognize the same need in the teaching of language and related subjects to non-English-speaking pupils.

When pupils are homogeneously grouped, they can be offered an intensive program in English as a second language. In the Miami schools we recommend that approximately one hour each day be devoted to oral drill. This hour can be divided into short periods commensurate with the children's attention span. The drill periods provide the pupils with activities which will allow them intensive oral practice of carefully selected language patterns, utilizing a limited vocabulary. The selection of the vocabulary used for oral practice should reflect, in the initial stages of language learning, the concepts, experiences, and interests which the children have already developed in Spanish.

For those of us who are elementary teachers traditionally trained, it is difficult to understand that the purpose of the oral practice is, primarily, habit formation and not problem solving or the teaching of concepts. The Spanish-speaking child who points to a pencil and struggles to say "No have" when he means "I don't have a pencil" is not struggling with the concept *pencil,* nor does the omission of the pronoun *I* indicate a faulty concept of self. He simply does not have the necessary language habits in English to express what he wants to say. Nor will he acquire the necessary habits by having the teacher say the sentence for him or by trying to draw the correct answer out of him. What he needs is practice in saying over and over again the correct statement and other similar statements, such as, "I don't have a book," and "I don't have a dime," practice which should take place in a meaningful experiential context.

The oral drill session should be the heart of the instructional program for the non-English-speaking child. It is the base upon which a large part of the rest of the program must be built. The successful teaching of language habits, to a large extent, depends on the skill of the teacher to develop meaningful, interesting, and stimulating oral practice which will motivate the child to use the language being practiced. Mechanical manipulation of language forms will result in boredom and poor progress on the part of the pupils, and in frustration for the teacher. Sufficient practice involving real communication about activities, objects, and ideas which are of real interest to the pupil should result in his mastering the structure, pronunciation, and vocabulary being taught.

Though oral practice is the heart of the program, it is also essential that the non-English-speaking child in the first grade learn to read and write English as soon as possible. Most children come to school with the expectation that they will learn to read. Their expectations should be met. In spite of the fact that many educators, including some foreign language teachers, believe that reading and writing should be delayed, it seems justified to insist that the instructional program for Spanish-speaking first graders should include the early introduction of a formal reading program. Most objections to the inclusion of reading for non-English-speaking pupils are based on what is accepted as the best order of presentation in teaching a language: the progression from listening to speaking, to reading, and finally to writing. This order of presentation is extremely important, especially in the early stages of language learning; however, this ordering can be applied to small units of language as well as to large. The child who can look at a picture of a cat running and say, "The cat is running," has sufficient listening and speaking skills to read the same statement when it is presented in written form.

Until materials are available for beginning reading instruction, the teacher should use the methods and materials, with some basic modifications, with which she is most familiar. Basically, these modifications must enable a pupil, through the oral practice session, to learn how to say what he is expected to read. If the child must read, "Spot can run," he should be able to say "Spot can run," before he tackles the problem of reading it. Furthermore, the teacher should not expect the child to be able to talk about what he has read unless he has been taught the language necessary to express these ideas.

A third aspect of the instructional program for these Spanish-speaking first grade pupils should involve writing. By learning to write that which he has learned to say and read, the child not only develops writing skills but also reinforces the language and reading skills he is developing. The content of the writing activities should be taken from the reading program. The teaching techniques should be those with which the teacher is familiar.

The hour devoted to oral practice and the hour devoted to reading and writing should integrate a highly structured formal program which can be thought of as a correlated language arts program for the non-English-speaking pupil. During the third of the day devoted to these activities the emphasis is on productive use of the language. In other words, the child must be actively producing the language forms being taught. During the remaining two-thirds of the day, he will be involved in what can be considered unstructured language activities based on areas of the regular curriculum. This learning is mostly receptive, for the child's ability to understand increases more rapidly than his ability to express himself. He will learn vocabulary and structure even during the part of the instructional program which is not an organized language program; that is, while participating in such unstructured language activities as art, music, and physical education. The child can also be successful in a grade level arithmetic program, since his achievement can be evaluated in terms of performance rather than through his ability to verbalize.

Science, health, and social studies, which are normally included in the instructional program for English-speaking first grade pupils, can also be included, to a limited extent, in the non-English speakers' program. But the Spanish speakers should not be expected to follow the usual grade level curriculum in these areas. The concepts usually taught should be subordinated to the language growth which can take place in activities involving science, social studies, and health. The pupil will probably be able to understand a great deal in these areas, but he will probably not be able to demonstrate his knowledge because of his lack of proficiency in English. The non-English-speaking pupil cannot be expected to be able, for example, to explain how to plant and care for a garden until he has developed sufficient control of the language to do so. Therefore, it would be best if the teacher were relieved of the necessity of developing the concepts related to these phases of the curriculum. The child can be successful in school at the end of the first grade even if he isn't able to describe a pulley or if he can't tell what happens to a letter when it is mailed.

The suggested instructional program for first grade non-English-speaking pupils can be summarized in terms of the following time blocks distributed over the school day: one hour for oral drill; one hour for beginning reading and writing instruction; one hour to one and one-half hours for art, music, physical education, and free play; twenty to thirty minutes for grade level arithmetic; and the rest of the day devoted to social studies, science, and health activities appropriate to the pupils' language proficiency. Of course, time should be left each day for evaluation.

The instructional program for first grade pupils which has been described is very similar to what can be developed for the second group of Spanish-speaking children who come into our schools; namely, those literate in their own language but unable to express themselves in English. Though their problem is serious, it is not as great as that which faces the first graders. Experience tells us that if a pupil can read Spanish he will be able to read English when he learns to speak it. The literate pupil always knows the relationship which exists between the groups of letters which he sees on a page and the sounds which he can make with his mouth. The literate child's most pressing educational need is to learn English.

An instructional program for these pupils should include approximately one hour of oral drill, as was suggested for first grade pupils, but presented in larger time blocks. It, too, should allow for sufficient practice so the pupils develop automatic control of the structure and pronunciation of English. These pupils should also spend approximately one hour a day on reading and writing activities which would be based on the oral drill. However, the approach to reading and writing for these children would be different from that for the beginning child. The emphasis should be on attaching the language they have learned in oral practice to the written representation of the language. With very little guidance from the teacher, the good reader in Spanish will be able to read in English almost anything he can say.

In addition to the reading on the oral language program, the literate Spanish-speaking elementary pupils should begin to read as early as possible in the content areas of science, social studies, and health. This reading, which can be called receptive level reading, should be a means to an end. That is, its purpose is not specifically to teach content, but rather to help the pupils transfer to English those reading and study skills which they have presumably acquired in Spanish. Naturally, the materials used would be considerably below the pupils' grade level. The techniques used in teaching receptive level reading would be similar to those normally utilized in teaching close factual reading. The pupils' reading should be guided by questions which can be answered in the exact words of the book, not by questions which would require pupils to use their own words. These pupils, like those who cannot read, should not be held responsible for the grade level curriculum in science, social studies, and health until they are sufficiently proficient in English.

These pupils should also have writing activities which would reinforce the oral practice and reading as they contribute to develop the pupils' skills in handwriting practice. The writing activities should lead into a spelling program. An effective approach to spelling should utilize both the structure and vocabulary the pupils are studying instead of using an arbitrary list of words in isolation. It is better to expect a pupil to write and spell correctly the sentence, "The boy is running," if that is what he is practicing, than to expect him to be able to spell a list of words which in no way will help him develop his ability to use English effectively in a school situation.

In addition to oral practice, reading, and writing—all of which should constitute about one half of the pupils' day—the pupils should be involved in music, art, physical education, and arithmetic. They should take part in all the other school activities appropriate for their grade level. As the pupils' proficiency in English increases, more and more of the regular curriculum can be added to their daily program so as to enable them eventually to be included in the total curriculum without special consideration for their language needs.

The instructional programs described thus far are suggested for the children who come into our schools knowing little or no English. We know, however, that there are many Spanish-speaking pupils in our elementary schools who can communicate in English fairly well. There are also a large number who can understand English quite adequately and who can say, in one way or another, anything they want to say. However, they still have trouble saying things the way native speakers of English would say them. They speak what might be described as a nonstandard dialect of English. These are children who can participate in the regular curriculum but who need to have special attention given to pronunciation and structure. For these children, since communication seems to present no problem, oral drill involving their everyday experiences holds little challenge. Motivating them to practice structure or pronunciation is difficult, but is no doubt imperative to teaching them successfully. To help these children we must utilize all of our resources as teachers. We must be creative. We must challenge them intellectually and at the same time provide situations in which we can give them controlled language practice. We must develop activities in which the children can focus on the activity but at the same time practice the language content.

Besides English as a second language and the subjects taught in English, there is another aspect of the instructional program for Spanish-speaking elementary pupils which should be provided. This part of the program applies to the truly bilingual Spanish-speaking child who is in no way handicapped in English, as well as to the child who still must learn English. We must recognize that the bilingual child's instructional program is not complete unless it enables him to become educated in Spanish as well as in English. Therefore, we should feel it as an obligation to our communities and to our pupils, to provide, in every situation where it is at all possible, the opportunity for the Spanish-speaking children to develop literacy in their vernacular. For too long we have allowed children who can speak and understand the language used in their homes to go through our schools without ever having to learn to read or write their first language. The Spanish-speaking child should be helped to appreciate his language and his cultural background. He should study his vernacular, not only, as some people suggest, to improve his self-image, but also to become a truly educated bilingual. A course which could be described as language arts in Spanish should be a part of the school's instructional program for all Spanish-speaking pupils.

It is obvious that in order to carry out the program here described, we need special materials. In the Miami schools we have found that Books I and II and, to some extent, Book III, of the *Fries American English Series* provide the most comprehensive base for building an English as second language program; however, the teacher must adapt them for use in the primary grades. At the present time, Dr. Pauline M. Rojas and Ralph F. Robinett are heading a Ford Foundation project which is developing an adaptation of this series for use in the United States with children who are literate in Spanish.

Another project which will meet another sorely felt need in the field is the development of a series of beginning language and reading materials which, it is hoped, will present a basic language and reading program for Spanish-speaking first and second grade children. These materials will be tried out in various first grade classes in Miami and other places, including the Southwest, during the 1964–65 school year.

Until more adequate materials are completed, we must learn to use those which are available. In order to do our job, we, as teachers, must develop a greater understanding of language and what constitutes language problems. We must become familiar with the findings of linguists and the techniques of second language teaching. We must learn to distinguish between language problems and academic problems. We must deepen our understanding of the problems which our Spanish-speaking pupils face in order to implement for them a more effective instructional program than we have offered them in the past.

The Supervisor's Role in Curriculum Development

Mary Finocchiaro

The ways in which the supervisor can help English teachers—and hence learners—is the subject of my talk. Before discussing the role of the supervisor, however, I think it important to distinguish between programs in the continental United States and programs overseas, including Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Whether the teacher copes with one or several native languages in her class, whether English is the language of instruction in the schools, whether it is the language of the community—any of these will make an appreciable difference in the English teaching program. Although basic principles of second language learning will be equally valid in all situations, such aspects of the program as approaches to skill development, duration of the course, and expected outcomes at each level will differ in each of the situations.

We must also distinguish between nationwide or community-wide programs for all young people reading a given age or grade level, and programs for literate, highly motivated students at the university level. I fear we may have done some learners injustice by imposing on them approaches and texts which had been prepared originally for highly literate groups. By the same token, adult students demand approaches and texts which differ from those used with a heterogeneous, often unmotivated student body.

Some of you teaching or supervising in continental United States may be surprised that I have not mentioned the supervisor's relationship to parents. The omission is deliberate. Although I feel that a cordial relationship should exist between parents and school personnel, I cannot agree with teachers and supervisors who excuse their inability to teach English on the ground that parents of Puerto Rican or Mexican or other ethnic groups do not show interest. They interpret as lack of interest the fact that many of those parents do not participate in school activities even when they are asked to do so.

Many students reveal that the majority of parents of these children are sincerely interested. Indeed, some have migrated primarily to improve the educational lot of their children. They prefer, however, to leave the school program to professionals. Unless the parent continuously prevents a child from preparing home assignments or from coming to school, the parent's nonparticipation should not affect the teaching process or program.

Let me start with the questions the supervisor should resolve with respect to the organization of classes. Will all learners with the same native language background be placed together? If so, the supervisor may use an existing comparative analysis of the student's native language and English or have a simple analysis prepared, underscoring only the main features of both languages, in their phonological, structural, lexical, and cultural aspects. The analysis would certainly assist teachers in anticipating students' difficulties. It would also be useful in the preparation of curricular materials.

With beginning language groups the supervisor may assign a teacher who knows the native language of the learners so that, particularly with older pupils, short cuts to learning can be devised through the *judicious* use of the student's native tongue.

Let us consider other questions with relation to organization. Are all learners grouped in classes according to ability level? If not, the supervisor will have to train teachers in the dynamics of group procedures. In addition, he will have to help teachers prepare appropriate materials at varying ability levels. If language learners are not placed in separate classes, that is, if native English speakers are in the class with language learners, additional materials are needed which will keep one group busily learning while the teacher is working with the other group. Another important question arises: Is English taught for only one or two hours a day? What provision is made for the language learners for the remainder of the day until they know enough English to participate with their classmates in the regular school program? What will be done to overcome the ever widening gap in the other subjects? Language learners cannot fail to be outstripped by their age peers unless special provision is made.

Several answers may be considered. (1) Language learners may be placed in separate groups for a flexible period of time devoted to the intensive study of English and to the acquisition of basic information in the other curriculum areas. They will be programed with their classmates in those curriculum areas where language difficulties present no barrier. (2) An abundance of learning materials can be prepared for use by trained teacher's aides, who will work with the language learners for three or four hours a day. (3) Some subjects, particularly mathematics and social studies, may be taught in the student's native tongue.

Another question with respect to organization concerns the teaching of the English language skills. Will one teacher be responsible for developing all the skills or will several teachers be involved? If the latter format prevails, the spuervisor will have to allocate time within the school day for teachers to meet to discuss mutual reinforcement and continuity of activities.

Let us now consider the placement of pupils. Is level of language learning or age the criterion for class placement? Is there continuous evaluation so that students can be moved to higher levels of English classes as soon as they can profit from them? Is there provision after the beginning level for more than one track in the curriculum or for remedial help for the students who cannot keep up with classmates?

In addition to the organization of the program and the placement of pupils, the supervisor is also responsible for the selection and training of teachers. If the teacher's only qualification is that he is a native English speaker, language learners are in difficulty. Teaching English as a second language has become not only an art but a science. Teachers need an awareness of the principles derived from linguistic science, the psychological sciences, and the anthropological sciences which are basic to the teaching of English as a second language. If the teacher's educational preparation has not been adequate in these respects, the job of teacher training calls upon the supervisor. Any curriculum is only as good as the teacher who uses it. We are speaking primarily of beginning teachers; but of course it is just as important for the teachers already in service to possess these same insights and to keep abreast of constantly changing developments in the field. The supervisor, aided by resource persons, should help teachers gain an understanding of the nature of language and language learning.

The matter of types and preparation of materials is most serious and requires much thought and cooperative effort. The teacher needs material designed to help students learn the basic items of English. She needs material to give the children needed orientation to the continental United States community. Much of this material has been written, but what is not made clear to teachers is the most appropriate use of the materials in the varying organizational patterns I noted above and in the problem situations I shall touch upon.

Since a major concern is that children enter the schools at various age levels with varying degrees of English knowledge, material will have to be prepared for different maturity and interest levels. We cannot use primers with fourteen-year-old children. Another problem is that children often enter school at different times during the semester. It would be impossible for the teacher to reteach material she has already covered. It is imperative therefore that graded worksheets, audio devices, programed instructional material, or a combination of these be made available which a "buddy" or teacher's aide can use in bringing pupils up to grade level.

Another problem which plagues supervisors and teachers is the mobility of many language learners in certain areas of our country. One way of coping with this problem would be to have a statewide or (in large urban areas) a citywide, carefully detailed curriculum guide, with language items and cultural items graded according to language level—beginning, intermediate, advanced—and *not* according to grade. An inventory test given by the school when a child is first admitted will enable the teacher to know which structures and vocabulary items the child already knows and at which point to start language instruction.

Today's emphasis on language as a spoken instrument of communication has made some teachers minimize the need for the skills of reading and writing. These should also be developed with appropriate materials. To accomplish this you may wish to consider the following stages. In the first, children will learn to read and write stories, dialogues, or experience charts which duplicate the material which they have learned to say well. The stage one material will be in the original form in which it was learned audiolingually. A caution: such material must differ depending on the age group of the children. Stage two reading material may be a recombination of sentences or expressions taken from the material which is thoroughly familiar to the students and used perhaps within the context of other social or cultural situations. In stage three, familiar material occasionally larded with new words and expressions should be introduced. This material may be related to the other curriculum areas which the language learners are studying. In stage four, the teacher may wish to use the simplified or adapted stories which abound in the commercial market.

Let me digress briefly, now, to mention the desirability of including, wherever feasible, the study of the student's native language. Insights into the nature and functions of languages, and particularly the feeling of status which the successful study of their native language brings to students, commends such a procedure.

Nor does the supervisor's responsibility cease with the creation of the curriculum guide. Materials and equipment which can hasten or vitalize the teaching of the curriculum content will have to be purchased and housed. A materials center—with guides, texts, audiovisual aids, and tests prepared in the school, in other school systems, by government agencies or commercial firms should be placed in the school library or in a specially designated teachers' central library. A language laboratory would be a highly desirable if not an essential aid in language learning.

Exhibits of commercial materials or of teacher-pupil prepared materials should be planned frequently. Exhibits serve many purposes. Teachers gain familiarity with work done by others in the same field; teachers whose material is on exhibit gain prestige and recognition; the community takes pride in the achievement of its children and its schools.

Finally, let me touch on one other aspect of the supervisor's role. Although he may give teachers specific directions in the use of the curriculum guide, he will nevertheless encourage experimentation.

No one really *knows* how many hours or days of purely audiolingual teaching should precede the introduction of reading. Won't the answer differ depending on the age and native language background of the pupil and the teacher's skill in relating reading to the listening and speaking skills?

No one really *knows* whether the formulation of general truths about the structure of language—after pupils have heard and said many examples in which the truths are embodied—would be helpful or harmful to students.

Perhaps in no curriculum area today is there more need for classroom research. The either/or edicts which have marked much of the recent literature in second-language teaching need to be put to the test of actual classroom practice. Much valuable testing of hypotheses can take place when the supervisor encourages and guides experimentation.

In any learning situation, the supervisor plays a key role in curriculum development. What he does about the organization of classes, the placement of students, the selection and training of teachers, the preparation of curriculum guides, the purchase of materials, the relations with supervisors in other schools or in other divisions of the school system will modify several aspects of the English program. The supervisor's attitude toward the use or teaching of the student's native tongue, toward experimentation, toward texts, or evaluation will also have an impact on the activities in the classroom. Finally, the supervisor's own knowledge and interest in language and learning will be an important factor in curriculum planning.

TOEFL: A Program for the Testing of English as a Foreign Language

David P. Harris

For those to whom TOEFL is just another unidentified and rather sinister appearing member of the unabating army of academic acronyms, let me begin with a brief description.

TOEFL is a program of English proficiency testing, designed to assist in the placement of foreign students applying for admission to United States institutions of higher learning. TOEFL is a 3-hour, 270-item objective test with 5 independently scored subtests devoted to listening comprehension, structure, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and recognition of style, usage, and diction appropriate for written English.

The test will, after this first year, be administered three times a year on a worldwide basis, a new form being developed for each regular administration. TOEFL was administered for the first time on February 17, 1964. It was taken by approximately 550 regular candidates and, for comparison purposes, by several hundred additional foreign students who were already enrolled in institutions of the United States.

The TOEFL administration was scheduled again for November 2, 1964. If you are not currently on the TOEFL mailing list and would like to be, please write us at 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

During the past year as Program Director of TOEFL, I have worn two hats—sometimes simultaneously. For I have had to be both test promoter and test writer. In some respects the two tasks are complementary, but in other respects they clash. For the promoter, to be successful, must maintain at all times a youthful enthusiasm for the merits of his product and be willing to describe that product in glowing terms. The test writer, one the other hand, while of course believing in the importance of his work, must develop and maintain a somewhat cautious and conservative attitude.

It is in my capacity as test writer, rather than promoter, that I intend to deal with the following three questions.

1) How Good a Test Is TOEFEL?

The honest test writer's reply to this question is that it is still too early to offer a definite answer. The test has been administered only once and then to a sample of fewer than a thousand cases. Yet certainly we are already beginning to gather some evidence. The educational tester would say that a test is "good" if it is reliable, valid, and practicable.

To be *reliable*, a test must be carefully written, be of sufficient length to sample adequately the skills with which we are concerned, and, of course, be secure—so that some candidates do not come to the test already armed with the answers. One of TOEFL's great advantages over its predecessors is that a new form will be used for each regular administration, and the test will be administered by experienced examiners in whom we have confidence. Thus we have every reason to suppose that test security is not a serious problem in the case of TOEFL. And the statistical estimates of TOEFL's reliability are most impressive: reliability coefficients for the five subtests run from .88 to .92. It would appear, therefore, that we shall be able to have confidence in the stability of TOEFL scores—even those of the shortest of the subtests.

There are several kinds of test *validity*. A test is *content* valid if it tests those matters which experts in the field consider significant, and in proportions which they regard as appropriate. The general outline of TOEFL was established by teachers of English as a Foreign Language and by testing specialists, working in concert. The test items are written by experienced teachers of EFL. We may hope, from this, that TOEFL *is* content valid according to our present understanding of EFL. This does not mean, however, that we will not need to submit TOEFL periodically to the review of EFL specialists and alter its content and emphases upon their recommendations. TOEFL is designed to meet the particular needs of its users, and we are firmly committed to a policy of seeking the advice of these users.

Another type of validity is called *concurrent* validity. Here we endeavor to determine whether our test tends to classify examinees in about the same way they would (at the same time) be classified by specialists in the field. To obtain an estimate of TOEFL's concurrent validity, we asked several universities to rank their foreign students in five or six categories as to English proficiency and then to administer TOEFL to these students. We were planning to include about 1,000 subjects in this experiment. Unfortunately, the numbers turned out to be far smaller than anticipated, but we did secure institutional ratings and TOEFL scores for about 360 students in 3 universities, and the correlations between ratings and test scores ran from .76 to .87, suggesting that TOEFL will prove to be valid as a classifier.

Still another kind of validity is *predictive*: to measure predictive validity is to determine how useful the test will be in predicting subsequent student performance. Obviously this kind of validation calls for follow-up studies on the academic success of students who have taken the test, and this will require time. And we may anticipate that such validation will always be a bit muddy: there are many factors besides English competence with contribute to academic success and failure, and no one, to my knowledge, has so far been very successful in isolating the language factor from amongst all the others. Yet predictive validation is obviously a type of research most important to pursue.

Finally, there is the matter of test usability or practicality: Is TOEFL convenient to use? We are committed to a policy, at least in the beginning, of administering TOEFL only three times a year and then only on dates set well in advance. Needless to say, no set of dates will be equally appropriate for all institutions. Here I can say only that we do the best we can, giving our National Council the responsibility for setting the dates which seem most acceptable to the majority of test users, actual and potential.

2) DO THE RESULTS OF THE TEST TELL US ANYTHING NEW ABOUT THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE LEARNING?

Once again the honest answer must be: Not yet—though in time they may. It is extremely difficult to determine with any certainty whether test performance reflects the realities of language learning or whether such performance is strongly affected by the particular techniques used in the testing. It is therefore always dangerous to conclude, on the basis of any one test, that language learning occurs in a particular way. Yet, since I cannot resist saying *something* on these matters, let me indicate a few of the things our early statistical analyses seem to suggest will bear watching. None of these, I would forewarn you, will astound the experienced teacher of EFL.

First, the difficulty of English lexical items seems to depend more on whether they are Latinate borrowings or native English than on their frequency in the written language, as indicated by the standard word counts. (Most of us concluded this long ago.)

Second, although there are quite high intercorrelations among the various subtests (as we would expect in a test devoted exclusively to language), the listening comprehension subtest has the lowest correlations with other subtests. It correlates rather well with structure (which we should expect); it has a rather low correlation with vocabulary, reading, and—lowest of all—with writing.

Third, the three highest intercorrelation values are those among structure, vocabulary, and writing ability.

Fourth, though the vocabulary and reading comprehension subtests are highly correlated, they appear to be measuring somewhat different things. This is what we would hope for, for certainly there is a difference between just knowing words and being able to follow, and interpret, stretches of university level reading matter.

One of the great delights—and challenges—of this job has been working with our experienced teachers of EFL. For TOEFL depends on TEFL's to write the test items though the items are, of course, thoroughly reviewed and worked over by the TOEFL office in Washington. At least a dozen TEFL's are involved in the preparation of each form of the test, and in time we hope to develop a very strong "hard core" of TEFL-test writers. Perhaps, as their numbers grow, we shall need a new term for these specialists. So far, the best I can devise is Examiners in English as a Foreign Language, and I'm not at all sure these people will appreciate being called EEFL's. But for the moment, let me phrase my third and last question:

3) HOW GOOD ARE TEFL's AS EEFL's?

In a few words, we have already uncovered some fine test writing talent. To be sure, not every good teacher of EFL, or writer of EFL teaching materials, makes a good item writer. But with every form of the test we are able to add several more first-rate test writers to our pool, and many TEFL's who were not particularly skillful EEFL's on the first try have learned how to write very acceptable items. Many a TEFL has discovered that the making of good tests is hard work. This, we think, is a valuable discovery for a teacher to make.

As a matter of fact, those of us who have witnessed the anguish of test writers new to this kind of EFL work do not feel smug about their traumatic experiences: *we* find TOEFL hard work, too. But we hope—and have some reason to believe—that it will perform a useful service.

Contributions of Testing to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language

Paul D. Holtzman and Richard E. Spencer

Traditionally, English language proficiency tests and teaching programs have been based on the assumption that foreign students are homogeneous in

1) their needs for English,
2) their methods of learning,
3) their cognitive logical structure, and
4) in the relationship between their English language proficiency and their success in American institutions of higher education.

At the Pennsylvania State University we have found evidence that there is little homogeneity in the problems foreign students must overcome in learning English. Therefore, a single test or a single program of teaching is an inappropriate solution to our problem.

We question the validity of English language proficiency as a criterion for admission to universities in this country. The United States is seeking those students who can profit most from American education, and, in turn, serve their countries best with that education. Evidence has been found which suggests that the customary selection system obtains a biased sample of students who may not have the best potential to contribute to the growth of ideas and technology in their home countries. The conventional selection criteria tend to produce a population that is conservative (in the sense of status quoism), one which becomes educated *within* the American technology and culture, and this American ecology is not matched by the facilities available in the host country. Another tendency has been to produce a population that often times is educated in one field, but practices in another,

By selecting those students who are already prepared in English, American schools may be contributing to this state of affairs by weeding out some of the leaders of industry, education, and opinion of the future. It may be, therefore, that colleges should exclude English language proficiency from the selection criteria and persevere in efforts to teach the language effectively and efficiently *after* selection.

The second assumption which our data refuse to support is that there is a necessary and direct relationship between English language proficiency and academic success, or that there necessarily should be. We have learned that academic ability seems to be relatively independent of English language proficiency. Thus, an English test validated by grade-point averages in American colleges is not necessarily a test of English language proficiency but may be seriously contaminated with quantities of intelligence and/or academic ability, and/or attitude.

Success in American academic work is only of secondary importance to our foreign students. Their primary focus, and ours, must be toward their success in the application of social change in their home countries. We hope that success here is related to that ultimate aim, but we know it is *not* perfectly related.

Another assumption is the one which divides language into the four factors of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. We have found that tests measuring these four areas are very closely related to each other. In factor analysis terms, they all load on the same factor. They appear, in fact, to be measuring more of the same thing, rather than measuring anything different.

In addition to the general language proficiency factor, we have also been able to identify two other factors which appear to be independent—an intelligence or academic ability factor, and a linguistic-cultural factor.

It appears, then, that English is not only a language. It is a logic as well. Effective English teaching, therefore, must concentrate on the following areas of instruction:

1) understanding of American or Western logic and concept system,
2) training in the application of what is learned through the medium of English, and learned in the United States, to problems presented in another language, another logic, and in another part of the world, as well as
3) proficiency in the language as the medium of communication.

To determine if there are any general divisions or categories of problems with the English language, we have, in one study, separated foreign students into groups based on the use of a Roman or non-Roman alphabet in their native language.

We have found consistently that the individuals who use a Roman alphabet are significantly superior on almost every subtest of English language proficiency, even though the group with the Roman alphabet had fewer months' experience in the United States, less English language training, were planning to stay in this country for a shorter period of time, and their educational level was lower than those students with the non-Roman alphabets. We suspect that this does not represent merely a mechanical difference. The two groups do not write English differently. The implication here is that the alphabetic difference is important primarily as a reflection of cultural differences, attitude differences, and differences between the logic of English and the logic inherent in the native language. We suspect that foreign students accustomed to Roman letters in their written language must be taught differently than those with exotic systems of notation. Again note that this difference need not be limited to the mechanical symptom of a difference but must be extended to plausible underlying concomitants with the orthographic difference—cultural, attitudinal, or logical.

Differences also exist between the *level* of language comprehension and the *speed* of comprehension. Not only should ELP tests reflect differences in subject matter, but they should also obtain differential measures of the potential speed or efficiency with which this student can handle learning in English.

Three other sources of variation among foreign students that significantly affect interpretation of English language test scores are (1) intelligence, (2) the level and extent of previous education, and (3) learning habits.

We find that it is impossible to measure the intellectual capability, or the academic potential, of foreign students on American standards of intelligence and ability quite easily. That is, we can measure the American intelligence of our foreign students. We do not know, however, whether these measures extend cross-culturally. We do not know that high American intelligence is also high Nigerian intelligence. We suspect, in fact, that there are intelligences rather than intelligence. Moreover, the student's previous preparation in his subject matter field certainly will have an effect on his potential success in this country. Then, too, most of our foreign students are from cultures which emphasize rote memory as an educational procedure. In the United States there is more emphasis on ability to synthesize, criticize, and evaluate.

If we were to recommend selection criteria for foreign students, we would emphasize the necessity of measures of

1) intelligence or academic ability,
2) achievement estimates in the subject matter field, and (only thirdly)
3) English language proficiency.

A measure of English must recognize that it is the area of *comprehension* that is most essential to the foreign student—the ability to understand and successfully ingest that which he reads or hears and, secondly, his capability to express himself originally and clearly in both writing and speaking. He can *learn* simply by using his eyes and ears, but we do not know what or how much he has learned without his expressive capabilities.

ELP tests are developed for different reasons—prediction and diagnosis to name two. Since very few other variables are tested in our foreign students, many ELP tests are used to predict the academic readiness or academic ability of the foreign student. We have found, that when used in this manner, the predictive efficiency is low. English language proficiency is a rather poor predictor of success in college of American students; it is an even poorer predictor of the potential success of the foreign student. A short ELP test may justifiably be used for predicting success in an English language program, or as a placement device into the English program; but, again, to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses in English of a variety of foreign students, representing a variety of cultures, a long and detailed English test is needed.

Our data suggest that it takes a different test to measure the proficiency of a technically trained student than one with an educational background in the humanities. We have developed two tests of reading comprehension. One deals with scientific reading material, the other with nonscientific material. The level of reading comprehension of foreign students differs according to which test is used. Individual students frequently score quite high on one and quite low on the other. In our factor analysis, the non-science test is associated with the general language proficiency factor, while the science test loads on a more specific factor which we might call a scientific academic ability factor.

Another point to indicate that heterogeneity exists is a familiar problem to every teacher of every subject to every kind of student: motivation. All other factors being equal, the student who cares little for learning English will do poorly in ELP classes. He may believe that he can get by in his scientific laboratory with the English he knows. Sharing living quarters with others from his own country may reinforce this attitude. He will not respond to testing or teaching as effectively as will his countryman who yearns to be at home with the language and with selected American friends. This turns out to be a far more potent factor than, say, the length of time spent in this country.

Two other suspected factors may be noted briefly. These represent differences we have not tested except informally. One is the *speed* of proficiency. The other is competence in the native language. The prospect of building tests to measure language proficiency in several hundred exotic languages gives one serious pause.

For the present, the following quick summary is in order:

As a result of tests developed over the past two and a half years, some basic assumptions about second language testing and teaching are challenged: assumptions that English language proficiency should be a criterion for admission to universities in this country; that academic ability and English language proficiency are highly correlated; that second-language ability factors independently into reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Further, it has been noted that English testing and teaching often appear to be based on the assumption that learning as a second language is the same kind of task for all English students despite apparent differences in cultural, attitudinal, and educational *weltanschauung* as well as systems for written notation of speech.

IV. Materials: Their Preparation and Use

Valerie Komives
VISUAL GRAMMAR: AN EFFECTIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING *English for Today*

Jean Jacobs
THE USE OF TEACHER-PREPARED MATERIALS

Walter P. Allen
INTERESTING THE INTERMEDIATE LEVEL LEARNER

W. Bryce Van Syoc
THE SCHEDULING OF CULTURAL MATERIALS IN LANGUAGE LESSONS

William R. Slager
INTRODUCING *Literature in English*: PROBLEMS IN SELECTING AND EDITING

Visual Grammar: An Effective Approach to Teaching *English for Today*

Valerie Komives

About 12,000 foreign-born come to Detroit, Michigan, each year. They come from the Near and the Far East, from South America, Africa, and Europe. While in some areas of the United States, we find a preponderance of one ethnic group in a study of the immigration figures, in Detroit we find men and women from all corners of the world. Ever since Henry Ford first started manufacturing automobiles and paying a $5.00 a day minimum wage, Detroit has been the destination of countless thousands from all over the world.

After World War II, the immigration patterns changed radically. The Refugee Act and the Preference Quota system brought to the United States professional men and women, the displaced intelligentsia of countries torn by war or revolution. With its need for engineers, nuclear scientists, and skilled workers, Detroit is still a magnet for the immigrant. Its special needs and opportunities may be the reasons for the high percentage of foreign-born—400,000 of a population of 2,000,000.

The Adult Education Division of the Detroit Public School system offers night classes in subjects from algebra to zoology, if sufficient students register to make a class self-supporting. This means that 22 students at a minimum are required to open a class of English for the foreign-born. There were 673 enrolled in these classes last semester.

Detroit is a city that has undergone dramatic changes in its neighborhoods. The pockets of ethnic groups that resulted in "Little Polands, Hungarys, Italys" with their own churches, community halls, and schools, have disappeared—and with them the kind of "Americanization Class" so delightfully described by Leonard Ross in his classic *Hyman Kaplan.* In its place we have classes that reflect the higher educational level of the immigrant and the integrated neighborhood. At the International Institute where I happen to teach, we have 250 students, many with college degrees, coming from 23 different countries. (No chance to use materials based on the comparative linguistic analysis of English and the student's native tongue!)

The change in immigration patterns was paralleled by an equally dramatic change in the field of language teaching. The linguist had come into the picture. Systematic analysis of language could now be applied to language teaching. Many teachers had long felt that books like *The Day Family* and *The Veterans' Reader* were not meant to teach language. Teachers were forced to prepare their own materials—an impossible task for which they were not equipped. The result was a hit-or-miss collection of lesson plans. It was about this time that Dr. George Owen became our supervisor for an all too short period of years. He gave us in his book, *Effective Pronunciation*, the tools to teach the sound system of English in an organized and systematic way. He helped us realize the ways we could apply the findings of the linguists to our language teaching problems. It was now that *Beginning American English* by Elizabeth Gillilan Mitchell showed what a textbook of English as a second language could achieve in a step-by-step mastery of a new tongue.

The announcement that a complete series of texts would be available, linguistically oriented, starting with Book I, for the complete beginner and ending with Book VI—*Literature in English*—was hailed as the answer to our prayers. May I say we are still praying for Books IV and V?

We welcomed Book I of *English for Today* and set to work finding ways to present these excellent materials effectively. Because teachers who relied on the pictures in the texts were unsuccessful in their attempts to drill patterns effectively, we supplied our teachers with crude but adequate do-it-yourself window-shade wall charts. The students closed their books and were stimulated by the chart, which brought the pattern to mind, to master the pattern so that it could be produced automatically. Another device which we have used increasingly over the past three years is a technique for helping the student visualize and even manipulate the pattern he is learning. We call this device "Visual Grammar." I want to describe it in some detail to you today.

Visual Grammar is a multisensory technique which uses a feltboard and syntactic symbols. It is aimed at helping the student receive a visual picture of the pattern he is learning, without the interference of words. I credit the inspiration for this technique to Dr. Donald Lloyd in his book, *American English in Its Cultural Setting*. He stated: "We must detach the structures, hold them up for inspection, and manipulate them apart from any sentences we find them in. We must shake the structures free from any particular words, so that we can see the *kind* of *words* that work in them."

While driving one day and watching traffic signals impart their unmistakable message to the motorist, I conceived the idea of using colored symbols that could be manipulated on a feltboard to represent the underlying structures of the sentence patterns. Free from lexical meaning, the colored symbols show the grammatical relationships and the structural meaning of the pattern.[1]

Let me introduce some old friends in new guise. Nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs are the four great word classes, the building blocks of the English language. In Visual Grammar they are symbolized by *rectangles,* blue with N for nouns, red with V for verbs, yellow with A for adjectives, and green with AV for adverbs. The two subclasses are pronouns and linking verbs represented by *squares,* blue with N for the pronoun, red with LV for the linking verb. Holding these building blocks in place are the so-called *structure words.* They act as the mortar in which the building blocks are set to form the structure of the sentence. These pattern signalling words are few in number--a few hundred at most—and they are repeated over and over, spoken in light or unstressed syllables. Perhaps because of this they are not given the attention they deserve by students of English as a second language. We are all familiar with the student who, having laboriously mastered a few thousand words of English by studying his native language and English dictionary, is bewildered, frustrated, and resentful when he finds that in spite of his "word power," he can neither understand nor be understood by the native speaker of English. He has failed to realize that the words he has so painstakingly learned operate in a *system* which he must understand and use. A language lives in its system and not in its vocabulary, and a key to the system of spoken English lies in analyzing and defining the structure words.

Structure words can be sorted into sets. Dr. Lloyd has called them "markers" or "group word starters." They are represented by *round* discs in our syntactic symbols like wheels that get things rolling. They follow the color scheme of the word classes they are associated with and are five in number:

1) *Noun-markers* (a blue disc with the letter **N** to match the **N** on blue rectangle and square). The typical noun-marker is the determiner. It sometimes limits our choice of the noun that it is marking, telling us in advance that we are talking of one or more things or giving us some preliminary information about it.

2) *Verb-markers* (a red disc with letter **V** to match the **V** on red rectangle and square). Various forms of "be," "have," and "do" and the modal auxiliaries make up this set.

---

[1] Editor's Note: For other ways of using colors in the grammar class, see the *Report on the Seventh Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study* (Georgetown University Monograph Series Number 9, December 1957) in which Robert L. Allen described "Graphic Grammar: The Use of Colors in Teaching Structure" (pp. 109–135).

3

(3) *Intensifiers* (a green and yellow disc with the letter **I**). The dual color scheme identifies them as patterning with both adjectives and adverbs.

4) *Prepositions.* We have chosen orange for the *Prepositions* which have the letter **P** on the orange disc. They mark the beginning of a phrase; they signal the coming of a noun. Frequently followed by a noun-marker, the preposition introduces other signals that tell us if the phrase will be an adjective or adverb phrase.

5) *Clause-markers.* The fifth and last marker is the *Clause-marker.* It is symbolized by a purple disc with the letter **C**.

The third group of syntactic symbols show inflectional changes in the words of the four word classes.

Plurals of nouns are shown by adding a blue half-disc with the letter "s" on it to the noun symbol. *Verbal nouns* are shown by adding the suffix "ing" written on a blue rectangle to the red rectangular verb symbol.

The three inflections that occur with verbs are the "s" written on a red half-disc to be added to all verbs in the third person singular, present tense, the "ed" written on a red half-disc to be added to all verbs to signal past tense, and the "ing" written on a rectangle to be added to verbs to show the progressive tense.

The suffixes "er" and "est" (comparative and superlative) are written on yellow and green rectangles. They belong to the intensifiers, strengthening or weakening the quality of the adjectives or adverbs they pattern with.

Two yellow rectangles with "ed," "er," or "ing" mark the participial adjectives. They pattern with the red rectangles of the verb word class.

The "s' " and "'s" written on yellow half-discs mark possessive adjectives patterning with the blue rectangle of the noun class words.

These then form the entire cast of our English language system. Since the linguist has identified about six basic sentence patterns of English statements, with a limited number of variations, let us translate these patterns into our symbols. Working through *English for Today* Book I, we can find the following:

N LV N *ex.* THIS IS A BOX.
N LV A *ex.* THIS BOX IS BIG.
N LV AV *ex.* THIS COAT IS HERE.

These are the three variations of Pattern 1 and are the only statement patterns used until lesson 10, page 55.

Here we find the **N V** and **N V N** patterns in the examples:

MISS GREEN IS DRAWING NOW.
MISS GREEN IS DRAWING A MAP.

No new pattern of the statement is introduced until in Lesson 25 we get

N V V ed pattern. *ex.* I WAS BORN IN 1951.

We have to look in *E.F.T.* Book II for the variation of this pattern. On page 109, **N V V ed P N,** for example, tells us the spine-tingling story that KHUFU'S BODY WAS STOLEN BY THIEVES.

Although clause-markers are introduced in Lesson 2, *E.F.T.* Book II, the remaining basic patterns of the statement are not used. They are:

N V N N *ex.* THE TEACHER GAVE THE STUDENTS HOMEWORK.

This pattern has two variations. The first one:

N V N A *ex.* THE STUDENTS THOUGHT THE TEACHER FOOLISH.

In the second variation, **N V N N,** the second and third noun refer to the same person or object. *ex.* THE STUDENTS ELECTED JOHN PRESIDENT.

The last basic pattern is **N V V ed N P N**

ex. 1 JOHN WAS AWARDED A SCHOLARSHIP BY THE COLLEGE.
ex. 2 A SCHOLARSHIP WAS AWARDED JOHN BY THE COLLEGE.

In using the symbols to demonstrate the difference between the statement and the question form in English, we can show the two patterns for comparison.

N LV N *ex.* THIS IS A BOX.
LV N N *ex.* IS THIS A BOX?

We can have the student come to the board and manipulate the pattern, changing the statement into a question by removing the **LV** symbol and placing it into the correct position. This technique is especially helpful in teaching the troublesome negative and question forms using *do, does, did.*

HE DRINKS MILK.	**N Vs N**
HE DOESN'T DRINK COFFEE.	**N Vs n't V N**
DOES HE DRINK MILK?	**Vs N V N ?**

English for Today covers the patterns of the question forms of English very thoroughly. Visual Grammar helps the student see the patterning of the question words.

The student can see the different patterns of "Who" in subject position and followed by **LV** or **V** symbols, and *Where, When,* and *Which* followed by the auxiliary verb, noun, verb pattern.

When a pattern has been mastered, the teacher can allow students to use their sometimes advanced vocabulary in the pattern just learned. Students enjoy this type of drill and become expert at it with a little practice. When given the pattern, **A N V AV**, my students have responded without hesitation with the generalizations:

SMALL CHILDREN TIRE EASILY.
NEW MOTORS RUN SMOOTHLY.

and even:

BRAVE SOLDIERS FIGHT HEROICALLY.

Visual Grammar can be used effectively to show a contrast between the English pattern and the pattern of the student's native language, e.g.:

English pattern	**N V N AV**	I BOUGHT THE BOOK YESTERDAY.
German pattern	**N V N AV V**	ICH HABE DAS BUCH GESTERN GEKAUFT.

These then are the advantages of Visual Grammar: The student becomes aware of the basic sentence patterns and the underlying relationships of the structures. It is a multisensory technique designed to unclutter the mind as it grasps for comprehension of the *system* that we call the English language. It goes beyond and beneath words and lays bare the skeletal bone which can be seen and manipulated. It allows the *ear* to hear the system, the *eye* to see the system, the *tongue* to produce the system, and *hand muscles* to move the system around on the feltboard. It is my hope that teachers will experiment with these symbols and find in their use an effective approach to the teaching of *English for Today.*

The Use of Teacher-Prepared Materials

Jean Jacobs

In 1872 the adult education program in Sacramento was inaugurated with a class in English for the Chinese. From that small beginning ninety-two years ago there has developed a program which is consistent with the growth of the city itself. In those early days, I've been told, there were no books available, so the teachers started writing their own materials. As time went on and the number of classes increased with more teachers participating, lessons that had been written began to accumulate, and someone started keeping them in files. In addition to the lessons filed, teachers cut pictures from magazines to illustrate the lessons. During the Depression in the early thirties, the teachers were assisted by WPA helpers who did a great deal in collecting and organizing material. Through the years almost every teacher who worked in the program contributed something in the way of material. Today we have the amazing total of 1,501 different lessons for our English classes.

The groups of lessons are divided roughly into beginning, intermediate, and advanced. Since we have day classes in which some of the pupils attend all day, some only mornings, and some only afternoons, we have two series of lessons which parallel each other; i.e., they have the same vocabulary and follow the same format. Thus the morning teacher and the afternoon teacher are not actually using the same lesson: rather, they are reinforcing the vocabulary and structure for those who attend all day. Five different series allotted to the beginners have about 350 separate lessons. Lesson One starts out "I want bread." (The teacher who wrote this series evidently was going by the old adage that bread is the staff of life, but from the looks of our classes, it would have been much more appropriate to say "I want rice.")

The first lesson consists of a few short lines about going to the store and buying the bread. On the lower part of the page are lines repeating the lesson with blank spaces to be filled in by the student. Naturally this lesson is used with a great deal of pantomine and pictures to illustrate the words. The teaching approach is a combination of the aural and the visual. First the lesson is spoken by the teacher and repeated by the class. This is done with, then without, the lesson sheets. Questions starting with *do* or *does* are then asked about the lesson.

Reading the handwriting of a language is usually much more difficult than reading the printing. To give our students practice in reading handwriting, we have pages of questions which accompany each lesson in two of the beginning series. They serve somewhat as a model for penmanship, particularly for those who come to us who cannot even make the ABC's.

The early lessons are very practical. They are all concerned with buying groceries, furniture, clothes, etc., taking the bus, writing excuses for the children's absence from school, and other familiar problems encountered in daily living. We do use books in connection with these lessons; they are *My First Dictionary*, a child's picture dictionary which I find invaluable in teaching the beginners, and Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward catalogs, which are every bit as good as dictionaries.

Some of our teachers have made flash cards to accompany the lessons, which are especially helpful in word recognition. We also use the cards for playing games in sentence structure. Two groups are formed, and each group is given a packet of cards which contains enough words to make a complete sentence. The groups sort them and place them in the chalk tray in the correct order to make the sentence. Each individual takes a card to the tray with much cheering from the "teams." The side completing the sentence first and correctly is the happy winner. At first the game is nothing but confusion, but when the students catch on to the idea, they find that it is fun—even adults like to play—and I do believe they learn a little as well. At least they have to speak English in order to work on a team where five to ten different nationalities are represented.

Our lessons become progressively harder. There are six different series for the intermediate level and three series for the advanced level. The subjects covered in these are just about anything you can think of. Some history and folklore are introduced, local customs and places of interest are described, etc. Grammar is taught in connection with the text of the day's lesson. Frequently we have the students change the entire lesson to questions in present, past, or future tense, then answer the questions with "yes" and "no."

Most of us are faced with the problem of trying to keep the classes at more or less the same level. Our students register at any time during the year. We do not have the money, space, or teachers to have an orientation class as we would like, so students coming in the middle of a semester are hard to place. Often they have some knowledge of English and actually do not belong in the beginning class, but they are very deficient in the structural aspects, particularly with our verb forms. In order to help these people make a rapid adjustment in the intermediate class, rather than waste the remainder of the semester in the beginning class, one of our teachers wrote a series called "Verbs." We have found this most useful. We also have three series of lessons which are primarily drill in grammar, written for the three levels. At present they are not organized in any really practical sequence; we hope to arrange them into some kind of logical order soon.

Many of you may wonder why we go to all this trouble now that there are so many excellent books on the market. In our district the school department does not provide books for those who attend adult education classes. Thus the students would be forced to buy their own, and many cannot afford them. In the past few years we have introduced a few inexpensive paperbacks. We try to see that every pupil has one, since to a foreign student ownership of a book means a great deal.

How do we keep this great mass of lessons available? It is no easy task. Stencils for every lesson are kept on file in the stencil folders. Approximately once each month the teachers check the files. (We have thirty steel filing cabinets with four drawers each filled with lessons.) If a folder is low, the teacher makes a note of it and turns it in to our secretary who writes it on a master card. The secretary then gets the stencil from the folder and takes it to our duplicating room where the students in the duplicating class run it off.

For the student who has finished a class exercise more quickly than others in the group, we have prepared envelopes of pictures, cut out of catalogs. The student goes to the box and picks an envelope, which contains about fifteen pictures. He takes them to his seat and tries to write the names of the objects. So that the teacher does not have to correct all of these, we have another set of cards in a second box. On this set the student can find the correct names for the objects in the corresponding envelope.

A second device for individual practice involves the use of an inexpensive magnetic bulletin board, made out of a piece of sheet metal mounted on cardboard. Individual students may go up to the bulletin board and choose cards containing words which can be arranged on the board by means of small magnets (100 for $1.00). The students enjoy and benefit from this practice in arranging and rearranging words; like the envelope device, it keeps the faster students from "just sitting" while waiting for their slower classmates.

I am not advocating our method of preparing materials for anyone who does not have a great deal of time and help. I *am* saying that we in Sacramento have found our system very effective. When a teacher writes something and finds it useful, he or she shares it with co-workers. We have built up our collection through the cooperation of our teachers through many years.

Interesting the Intermediate Level Learner

Walter P. Allen

An intermediate level student is one who has learned some English, but not enough to compete with native speakers in college classes. Even within one intermediate class there is likely to be wide variation in levels of ability, as well as in numbers of years of previous study. Such a diverse group is obviously difficult to cater to. The problem is to find a framework within which to organize the course so as to give needed practice on basic patterns through the use of material that is challenging to each student, material that offers everyone something new to learn.

Most of the needs of the intermediate level learners can be met by teaching a new approach to the language. In using this new approach, it will be possible to give the needed practice in the basic patterns. The exercises and drill material will be given in the new format. Even for the more advanced in the class, the problems to be solved will be of a new type. And the learners at the lower end of the scale will have the training they need. There will be new material for all the students to learn. Thus each student will be stimulated by acquiring new knowledge. It will be possible for the teacher to maintain the interest of the whole class, the more advanced as well as the more elementary learners.

This spring semester at the University of Houston I have been attempting this approach in English 156 (Second Semester Freshman English for International Students) by using Paul Roberts' *English Sentences* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962). In his Preface, the author states that his text is written for United States high school students. Therefore it must be adapted for a class of non-native speakers. However, the adaptation needed for this book is much less extensive than that needed with many texts written for United States students. As Roberts was presenting a new approach to grammar, he had to write much more explicitly than if he had been writing a traditional grammar which he knew his readers had been over before. Additional material such as exercises in the use of articles, prepositions, and two-word verbs may be introduced at appropriate points.

Roberts has adapted parts of transformational grammar for presentation in *English Sentences*. He leads the learner very slowly, one step at a time, up the ladder of understanding. The book is amazingly simple when compared with Chomsky's writing on the same subject. Some years ago I made a study of possible measures of readability of material for students learning English as a foreign language. The study showed that readability for foreign students was affected by the proportion of different hard words (i.e., words not on Dale's list of 769 easy words), the proportion of structural variations from the Subject-Verb-Complement sentence pattern, the proportion of words in dialog, and the proportion of dialect.[1] Five pages in the first five chapters of *English Sentences* were checked: of the 1,600 words analyzed, only 15 percent were different hard words; structural variations of the S-V-C pattern came to only 2 percent; and only 1 percent of the words were in dialog. There was no nonstandard dialect in the passages checked, though some of the sentences for correction in some of the exercises could well fit into this category. The earlier study indicated that less than 25 percent of different hard words could be considered easy material as far as vocabulary went, so on this first factor Roberts' book can be rated as easy reading for foreign students. Roberts' sentence patterns are also very simple, and the amount of dialog is negligible. On the basis of the items analyzed, *English Sentences* can be considered an easy book for foreign students to read.

---

[1] W. P. Allen, *Selecting Reading Materials for Foreign Students* (Washington: English Language Services, 1955), pp. 67–73.

Although the transformational approach to grammar is new, Roberts uses much familiar terminology. The students will not find the book a difficult breach with their previous training. Each short chapter is followed by exercises which are useful for class recitation or homework assignments and which make it possible to check on the progress of the students.

Roberts begins with a study of ten basic sentence patterns and then takes up a few simple transformations, noun clusters and verb clusters, fragments and run-on sentences, immediate constituents, intonation and punctuation, questions and negatives, and pronunciation and spelling.

As Roberts was writing for American students, *English Sentences* does not have all the material that is needed for a course in English as a foreign language. His exercises do give a great deal of practice in analysis and in production of sentences, but I feel that the EFL teacher needs to add other types of practice in sentence patterns and pronunciation. This semester I have been using *Spoken English* by David Thompson and others, produced at the English Academy in Kyoto, Japan, for drill sentences and oral practice. The English Academy has published an accompanying book, *Pattern Dialogs.* I have found the use of these pattern dialogs and the material in *Spoken English,* especially Volume 4, to be very useful.

As English 156 meets for five hours each week, there is also time for reading and composition. In the first part of the course, the readings are taken from *Reading in English* by Danielson and Hayden.[2] This has a number of well-written short selections which are accompanied by a variety of vocabulary and content exercises. These is also a group of discussion or composition topics with each reading, which I have found very handy for starting class discussion or for stimulating composition work. Most of the composition assignments have been based on these topics. The reading for the last month will be devoted to a novel, *O Pioneers!* by Willa Cather.[3] Willa Cather's writing is easy reading and the story gives a lot of background for the American way of life.

The composition work of the course culminates in the production of a research paper, for which we use Robert M. Schmitz, *Preparing the Research Paper.*[4] This pamphlet is frowned upon by some of the members of the English Department because the sample research paper gives some references to *Time* and *Life,* but the international students have been able to use it very profitably. By having the students follow the step-by-step procedure and by checking each step as it is accomplished, the teacher can guide the students into an understanding through practice of this necessary university exercise.

Summing up, then: To maintain interest in the intermediate level learner, the teacher can use material which will give everyone in the class something new to learn and will give extensive practice in the basic sentence patterns. Paul Roberts' *English Sentences* can be used for these purposes, as I have discovered this semester. As the book was written for American students, extra material will have to be added for students learning English as a foreign language, but the book is much better for our purposes than most books designed for the United States classroom. The final test of the method will come as my students go on to other courses in the university, but I know that this semester they have had an interesting time manipulating this fascinating language of ours and at the same time gaining a deeper understanding of how it works.

---

[2] Dorothy Danielson and Rebecca Hayden, *Reading in English* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961).

[3] Willa Cather, *O Pioneers!* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Sentry Edition, 1962).

[4] Robert M. Schmitz, *Preparing the Research Paper* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957).

The Scheduling of Cultural Materials in Language Lessons

W. Bryce Van Syoc

It has long been one of the commonly held tenets of foreign language teaching that dissemination of cultural information about the communities speaking the target language should be an integral part of the instruction. Too few teachers and textbook writers, however, seem to have given due consideration to just how and when cultural facts should be injected into the language lessons to achieve maximum results from both the language lessons and the dissemination of cultural information.

A survey of a number of foreign language textbooks shows that many textbook writers begin to introduce what are hoped will be interest arousing, student motivating tidbits of cultural differences with almost the very first lessons. For example, a recent beginning French textbook, allegedly written according to the latest linguistic theories, starts with almost the first lesson to explain the difference in numbering floors in apartment and office buildings in France and the United States. Similar cultural differences are worked into the drills for teaching new sounds, new directions of modification, and new uses of articles, as well as teaching the inflections of the French verb system both by sight and sound. I would like to suggest that even though the cultural material introduced may be very easy to comprehend, it can actually interfere with or slow down language learning in the beginning stages and that writers and teachers might do better to present a minimum of such material until a later date, or simply present it briefly in the student's own language. In general, this seems to make for more efficient learning, and in the end for greater student interest.

One of the aims of the language textbook writer or teacher should certainly be to generate student interest in learning the new language. My own opinion, based on many years' experience in teaching English as a foreign language and in writing or supervising the writing of textbooks for both beginning and advanced students of English, is that the author should expect the motivation for language study to come from learning the language itself rather than from nonlinguistic sources. If the language teacher himself becomes genuinely interested in his students' mastering the sounds, stress patterns, intonation contours, new morphological arrangements, direction of modification, and the like, and is able to transmit his enthusiasm to his students, this will act as a stronger and more valid motivation toward language learning than giving the students large doses of cultural information. The tendency of textbook writers and teachers to want to expose students to what may be interesting differences or oddities in the communities that speak the target language can not only act as an impediment to language learning but can even interfere with the student's eventually learning about the deeper aspects of the new culture which he can attain by using the target language directly at a later stage when he has more nearly mastered it. In other words, if the presentation of cultural differences can be delayed until the basic linguistic matters have been mastered, the students will be able to grasp much more about the new culture in the end if cultural material has not been overstressed or *substituted for true language teaching.*

But we can not teach the linguistic aspects of a language in a vacuum, of course, so we must perforce do something about providing a medium in which the individual seeds of language can take root and grow. We must endeavor to find just the right type and right amount of cultural feeding through which the maximum growth can best take place.

How do we arrive at the desired formula? How can we know what cultural items can best be used and when they should be applied? In other words, how should cultural information be scheduled in language teaching?

Comparison of the nonlinguistic aspects of culture belongs to other disciplines than linguistic science, but since we can not teach linguistic structure without a medium, we must be involved from the start in the selection of cultural items which can be used as the medium for our instruction.

For this purpose cultural material can roughly be divided into four categories. To begin with, we know that between two separate cultural areas there are certain features of living which are similarly manifested in both cultures and which have similar significance. For practical purposes we can say they overlap. Unless one makes an objective comparison, the overlapping cultural features for two given areas can not always be predicted precisely, but the author or teacher can look for them in such general fields as family relationships, school activities, food and shelter, tools, recreation, transportation, and the like. These overlapping features comprise our first category, and, in my opinion, it is the only practical category upon which to draw for beginning lessons.

A second class of cultural features may have the same manifestation in the countries being compared but have a different meaning; for example, kinship terms, gestures, greetings, use of the eyes, manner of dress, and so forth.

A third class of features may have the same meaning in both countries but a different manifestation. For example, most children get hungry between meals. This hunger may be satisfied in Topeka with some munchy-crunchy corn crisps but in Thailand with a freshly toasted piece of dried squid or a slice of green guava dipped in sugar and chili peppers.

In the fourth category are cultural features which do not overlap in any way in two cultural areas. A Burmese student might not be particularly surprised to learn that his friend's aunt who lives in the back country has been eaten by a crocodile; but for him the fact that trains run in tubes under the ground in Boston, Madrid, or Moscow is too far removed from his experience to be easily credible.

This makes, then, four distinct classifications of cultural features from which to choose in order to provide meaningful drills for a complete course of language study: first, those that are roughly the same in form, distribution, and meaning in two given communities; second, those that overlap in form, or form and distribution, but not in meaning; third, those that overlap in meaning but have a different manifestation; and fourth, those that do not overlap in any way.

For the beginning lessons—let us say until the sound system has been taught and the basic sentences with their more common transformations have been drilled and made matters of habit for the student—it seems wise to select cultural items from the first group only, where features overlap in both form and meaning.

This means that the teacher does not rely on novelty of experience as a means to motivation. Instead, the students must be motivated in the early stages of language instruction primarily by their eagerness to learn a new linguistic system. There will be supplementary motivation for them if they realize that when they can use this new language system they will be able to express or describe their own culture in a new code. It is somewhat akin to the spirit that motivates children to use pig latin. Of course the bilingual child already has this strong motivation because he desires or needs to express his environment through two language codes.

Although it is relatively simple to keep children motivated, some teachers complain that adults get bored unless they are learning something unusual about the new culture. This need not be the case: teachers employing sound linguistic methods find adult beginners just as much interested as children in learning the new sounds of English and its morphological and syntactical aspects, perhaps even more so. Besides, there are many overlapping cultural items of interest to adults. Textbook or drill writers can include adult social situations and other human relationships, the provision of shelter in all its aspects, the provision of food, the professions, or geographical phenomena, for instance, without getting involved with such cultural differences as the number of cars in a family, dating and courtship versus arranged marriages and dowries, the social status of teachers, or political theories. Most adults interested in learning a second language already have considerable sophistication, so the areas of cultural overlap are quite extensive.

Every school of thought has its extremists. An occasional text writer has frankly avoided the problem of selection of cultural materials by using nonsense syllables for pronunciation drills, thus eliminating any possibility of involvement in questions of cultural orientation. Individual teachers may be able to teach pronunciation this way, but for teachers in general, such a procedure is questionable. Syllables alone seem to have less motivating power than actual words from the target language. If the student knows he is practicing new sounds in words he is going to use, his motivation seems to be greater. For example, if we wish to teach the voiceless interdental fricative of English in contrast to the "s" sound, the drill can include such useful pairs as "sum-thumb," "sank-thank," "sink-think," "pass-path." All the words in those pairs could easily be usable in the first category of cultural information; but, the pair "sane-thane" should be avoided because the student is not apt to use the second word in the pair until he has studied English deeply enough to read *Macbeth* or one of the historical novels of early England or Scotland. In other words, such a pair of words would not be useful until the students are ready for the third or fourth category of cultural information.

Similarly, if one is teaching English plurals to students whose native language does not express plurality with a bound plural morpheme, the complication of the morphophonemics of the English plural morpheme are quite enough to challenge the students without confusing the situation even more by giving them new cultural information in the same lesson or lessons, or by giving them cultural information that is interesting enough to distract them from the purpose of the lesson. Expansion of sentences and transformations of kernel sentences can be taught in familiar cultural framework if the writer takes the time to find situations which are common to both cultures.

The reading sections of each lesson, which I believe should follow the pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary drills, should also be controlled by the same principle. I like to think of the reading as a reward to the students for having learned their lesson well. If, in addition to reviewing and reinforcing pronunciation, grammatical, and syntactical drills, the reading passages also contain orientation to new cultural concepts, the student is likely to be somewhat frustrated and not have the satisfying experiences which are highly desirable in the beginning reading lessons.

In a similar way, drills for writing are more likely to succeed in fulfilling their purpose if the student is not involved in trying to write something new about culture when what he really needs is to practice the graphic symbolization of the new linguistic features he has studied.

It is not easy to write language textbooks along these lines. Much research is needed in order to prepare lessons that are interesting and yet linguistically and pedagogically sound. Of course such textbooks do not present the colorful or dramatic material as textbooks do which base their motivation on descriptions of cultural differences. Some language teachers find such textbooks boring, often because they do not really want to teach language skills, but actually want to teach literature or perhaps a social science. But the true language teacher gets his professional satisfaction in seeing the comparative ease with which his students can learn the linguistic system of a new language. And the student's success is the student's motivation and reward.

Introducing *Literature in English:* Problems in Selecting and Editing

William R. Slager

This paper is essentially a brief report of some of the problems that came up during the editing of *Literature in English,* Book VI of the *English for Today* series. But I hope my intention is clear enough: this account of a single anthology is simply a convenient way of suggesting some of the techniques and procedures that must be developed and refined in the next few years as we turn our attention increasingly to the teaching of imaginative literature to the foreign student.

The editors of any anthology usually find their work organized in two stages. In the first they are concerned with defining the scope of their table of contents and choosing the actual selections, and in the second they are concerned with providing useful machinery to aid the reader in comprehension, interpretation, and appreciation.

We chose to limit our selections to imaginative literature, a choice which automatically eliminates, for example, the how-to-do-it essay, whether it be how to read a book or how to learn a foreign language.

As a consequence of our commitment to anthologize imaginative literature, we were obliged to consider how many of the literary types should be included. It made sense, it seemed to us, to include all the major types. Certainly prose, both fiction and nonfiction, was our starting point. We determined to look first for short stories that had obvious plots and conventional language. We assumed, too, that we had to include some short stories that were more complicated in their structure, that emphasized theme rather than plot. And we wanted to introduce students to several stories that through intricate imagery or dialectal variations were more demanding in their use of language. The essays, however, were more difficult to decide on. How does one determine when an essay goes beyond ordinary prose and becomes literature? In this case, style seemed to be the chief criterion. If the essays were written in such a way that style contributed to their meaning and their total impression, then they would qualify for the anthology.

Drama presented a problem in space. There was no room for a full-length play, and no one is particularly happy with bits and snippets. Our solution was to choose two one-act plays. Plays, of course, are among the most valuable ways of introducing the foreign student to literature. A play is a long dialogue, a conversation from beginning to end, and this kind of conversational English is closest to the English the students have learned. Plays, too, provide opportunity for valuable oral practice.

The last literary type to be considered was poetry. Once we had decided to include poetry, and once we knew that only so many pages could be devoted to poetry, the next question was whether to represent a variety of poets with a poem or two each, or to represent a few poets with a number of poems. Since poetry is the most difficult literary type for native speakers as well as for foreign students, we decided to follow the latter course. We reasoned that once the students have learned to read several of Frost's poems, they can read other poems by Frost with greater understanding and ease. Once they have become accustomed to Emily Dickinson's imagery and stylistic tricks, her other poems become more meaningful. Our anthology, then, would include short stories, essays in which style figured prominently, and two one-act plays. It would also introduce a few poets (we finally decided on six) who would be represented by a "teachable" number of poems. A teachable number, by the way, came to mean not less than seven.

Before we began to search for the actual selections, we had to determine in some preliminary fashion which authors we were going to consider. Eventually we hit upon three criteria here: that the authors should be contemporary, that they should be distinguished, and that they should represent as wide a geographical spread as possible.

The most forceful argument for contemporary literature is a linguistic one. The demands of literary language on the inexperienced reader are heavy enough without asking in addition that he deal with an English that is several hundred years old.

The decision to limit the authors to those who were clearly distinguished was relatively easy to reach. There is no reason why students being introduced to literature in English should not be introduced to the best. If one chooses with care, writers of distinction are just as accessible as writers of lesser stature. A few, of course, are clearly ruled out. William Faulkner's sentences, which often confound experienced readers, are out of place in an introductory anthology. So is the prose of Henry James or Joseph Conrad. But many of our well-known writers are admirably clear and straightforward. Hemingway's short stories, for example, have pages of simple conversations that to the TEFL often seem like pattern practices written to order. Essayists like Julian Huxley—though demanding—use a standard English that the well-trained foreign student with a good dictionary can understand readily. Among the poets, Frost with his natural colloquial style and Housman with his classically spare style are ideal. Any number of our best playwrights, when they do not write in dialect, could be included in an anthology. Barrie and Saroyan, whom we decided to use, have many plays that are good for this purpose. But Eugene O'Neill, whose eminence is unquestioned, does not: many of his one-act plays are full of dialect and slang that would require constant explanation.

Recently we Americans have become increasingly aware of the substantial literatures in English that have been and are being produced around the world. The *Times Literary Supplement,* in an issue entitled "A Language in Common" (August 10, 1962), had a number of fascinating articles on literatures in English emerging around the world. (This issue, by the way, has been reprinted by NCTE and can be ordered from the Champaign office.) Certainly any future anthology should attempt to represent these literatures as widely as possible. In *Literature in English,* we included two Indian writers, an Australian, a Canadian, a Scotsman, and three Irishmen. But we recognized that this was only a beginning. In Nigeria and other parts of Africa, an impressive literature in English is being produced, some of which is becoming available here. Amos Tutuola's wild and wonderful *The Palm-Wine Drinkard* (New Directions) does things to the English language that have never been done before; it proves once again, if proof is needed, the flexibility and vitality of English. In the Philippines, there is already an extensive literature written in English. Literature in English is also being produced in the Far East and the Caribbean West Indies. Writers from these areas were omitted from the first edition of *Literature in English* not because we did not recognize their value but because we felt that we needed to know more about the Commonwealth writers and the other writers throughout Africa and Asia before we could select intelligently.

One last problem arose in defining the table of contents—the problem of whether to simplify or shorten any of the selections. It was immediately apparent that an introduction to imaginative literature should not present simplified versions. A short story that is simplified is not the same as a piece of literature, though it may, of course, have legitimate uses in developing reading speed and comprehension at an earlier stage in language learning. Simplified versions, then, have no place in a literature anthology. Occasionally, however, it is possible to *shorten* a selection without destroying its effect. But we were very cautious about this kind of thing; as I recall, we shortened only three selections.

Our decisions about editing were influenced first of all by the fact that we were committeed to producing a teacher's text as well as a student's text. This meant that we had to distinguish, if we could, the kind of basic help that should be given to the student from the kind of supplementary help that might be given to the teacher to pass on at his discretion.

One kind of help the students needed might be referred to broadly as literary. Since the students were being introduced to imaginative literature, they would need to know some of the terms that are commonly used in discussing literary techniques. These terms, we decided, could be most economically presented in brief introductions to each of the four literary types: fiction, nonfiction, drama, and poetry. The writing of these introductions was a sobering experience, sobering because we constantly had to ask ourselves what literary terms were necessary to the foreign student approaching literature in English for the first time. If the clichés of the conventional high school literature anthology could be avoided, all the better. Many of the things that are still said in some of the high school anthologies—for example, that a story has a beginning, middle, and end—no longer seemed very helpful. Indeed most of the contemporary short stories we wanted to use did not have such an obviously neat structure. What terms, you might ask, *did* seem necessary? An example or two should suffice.

In the introduction to fiction, the important distinction between *plot* and *theme* is explained. In the introduction to nonfiction, the meaning and importance of *style* are emphasized. In the introduction to drama, the problem created in reading a play as opposed to seeing a play is discussed, and terms such as *exposition* are brought in to clarify the special problems the playwright faces. In the introduction to poetry, *meter, rhythm, rhyme,* and *imagery* are introduced briefly. But it seemed unnecessary to elaborate on the different kinds of meter and the different rhyme schemes or to make such fine distinctions as that between *simile* and *metaphor*. I can best summarize by saying that we avoided the tendency to teach literary terminology as such, just as earlier we had avoided the tendency to teach grammatical terminology as such.

The next kind of help provided was by way of introductions to each selection. These introductions, deliberately brief, had no particular format that was carried out consistently—that is, their content was determined by the selection itself. Sometimes they were purely for motivation, as in the introduction to "The Open Window," where the reader is told that a young lady is going to play a trick on a visitor to her aunt's house and that he must watch closely how the young lady behaves. Sometimes the students are given biographical facts, as in the introduction to Julian Huxley's essay on birds, where the reader is told that Huxley is secretary of the London Zoological Society. Sometimes they are given the meaning of an important word or phrase, as in the introduction to "My Oedipus Complex," where they are told about the Oedipus complex and are reminded that this attachment of a boy to his mother is a subject that can be dealt with humorously. Sometimes they are told something of the author's ideas about literature, as in the introduction to Whitman's poems where they learn about Whitman's belief that America needed a new poetry, one that departed from the artificial conventions of the past and employed everyday speech.

What they are *not* told—and this point is worth emphasizing—is that the short story or the poem will be good for them, that they will appreciate the selection, that they won't find it nearly so dull or meaningless as they are expecting it to be. In other words, they are not given the hard sell. Such an approach seems to give shape to the critical comments in many of the best anthologies for high school students. At least some young Americans, it seems, must be persuaded that imaginative literature has value. But as those of you who have taught abroad are well aware, young people in many cultures assume that imaginative literature has the highest value. To say of an Arab that he writes good poetry is to pay one of the greatest compliments that can be paid a man.

The next step in editing was to supply footnotes. Some of the selections had to be footnoted frequently if the students were not to bog down in their reading. But supplying footnotes for foreign students, we discovered, can be a tricky job. Just how does one decide what to footnote and what not to footnote? It does not help much to agree that one will explain "hard" words. How does one determine, in an anthology for foreign students everywhere, what words the students might find hard? One thing was clear of course: that some criteria had to be set down.

One way to limit the footnotes—and I suppose we would all agree that we can not footnote everything—is to begin with the assumption, admittedly a fiction, that the students have access to dictionaries such as *The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (Oxford University Press) or the *Thorndike-Barnhart High School Dictionary*. But since dictionaries ordinarily provide definitions for words used only in their conventional senses, the foreign students must be given the kind of information that dictionaries do not have.

One kind of information is information about places. For example, Priestley, in his little essay on "Making Stew," says that the reader "might travel from Truro to Inverness, even today, and be offered nothing better than or as good as my stew." If the students know that Truro is at the southwestern tip of England and Inverness in the north of Scotland, then they know that Priestley is really saying you can walk from one end of Britain to the other and you won't find any other stew as good as his.

Figurative uses of language frequently need to be footnoted. For example, Frost, in "Mending Wall," refers to his neighbor like this:

> He is all pine and I am apple orchard.

The poet is saying, of course, that his neighbor has pine trees on his land and that he himself raises apple trees. This kind of figurative language, which is simple enough for the native speaker, is often very difficult for foreign students.

Another kind of information that should be supplied in footnotes and elsewhere, a most important kind for the foreign student, is that which Anita Pincas, in an interesting article in *Language Learning* (Volume XIII, Number 1, 1963) calls "cultural translation." Following the lead of Robert Lado and others who have suggested that cultures as well as languages can be compared and that such a comparison should be used in the development of teaching materials, Miss Pincas presents a scheme for comparing the culture of the students' language and the culture that serves as background in the particular literary work they are reading. Using C. P. Snow's novel *The New Men* for illustration, she shows how the teacher can set up three columns as guides for detecting and analyzing points that might be culturally significant. One column has quotations from the novel that contain cultural items, another defines the meaning of the cultural item in England, and a third explains the meaning of the item in the culture of the students. Such a scheme, of course, works best when the students share a single cultural background and would not have been possible in the universal edition of *Literature in English*.

One final bit of editorial machinery we added to the student's text. Each selection is followed by comprehension questions that are similar to Percival Gurrey's "Stage One" questions. That is, all of them can be answered directly from the reading. The assumption here is that the students' principal task is to know in precise detail what the author is saying. More complicated questions that require the students to make inferences, to evaluate, and to apply the readings to their own experience, are reserved for the Teacher's Text, since it is assumed that the teacher can use his discretion as to when and how many of them to use.

The Teacher's Text includes extra information of all kinds to help the teacher introduce the selections and guide discussions. The notes supplied for each selection vary in their emphasis. Sometimes the teacher is given historical and cultural background that he can present to the class. For example, before "Rashid's School at Okhla," a chapter from Santha Rama Rau's book *Home to India,* the teacher is told about the Congress Party's program in "basic" education. Sometimes the teacher is given a short list of "Key Words," words important to the plot, to the theme, or to the imagery. Before they read Barrie's play, "The Will," for example, they are introduced to legal terms like *bequest* and *legacy*. Before they read Frost's poems, they are introduced to Frost's figurative use of everyday words like *sleep* and *road.*

In the notes that are to be used after reading the selection, the teacher is given some of the questions that Gurrey would call "Stage Two" and "Stage Three" questions—that is, questions that ask the student to interpret, to evaluate, or to make applications. After reading "Rashid's School at Okhla," the students are asked to consider the responsibility that teachers have and how this responsibility is met in their own schools. They are asked to consider, also, the conflict between public and religious education.

One final feature of the teacher's text is that the comprehension questions asked in the student's text are all answered. There were several reasons for giving these answers. One was that the teacher might have a limited background and would feel more secure if the answers were provided. Another was that these answers might serve as models to train the teacher so that as he read more he would be more certain of his own ability to answer questions. The answers might also, of course, serve to keep the class discussions in hand: if necessary, the teacher has an "authority" to which he can refer.

But I must confess that there proved to be other advantages to this device. Being forced to answer one's own questions is a revealing experience. Often we were obliged to recast the original questions so that we could answer them ourselves. And on several occasions we had to abandon a selection because, after considerable give and take, we could not agree on the answers. If we could not agree among ourselves, it was obvious that the selection was too difficult for our audience.

So much for a brief summary of the development of *Literature in English.* But now for a word about what we were not able to include in our editorial machinery and what I would like to see included in future anthologies. What I am thinking of here is the possibility of choosing, for example, certain complex sentences as models for the students to use in building sentences of their own—or of choosing certain paragraphs as models for them to use in writing paragraphs of their own. In *Literature in English,* the selections were never used as a basis for systematic practice in spoken or written English because we were strictly limited in space and because we reasoned that learning to read literature with care and understanding was a sufficient goal. But the absence of such material in *Literature in English* does not mean that we were unaware of its value. For the foreign student, reading of any kind, including reading in imaginative literature, should have as one purpose the improvement of his language skills. Certainly future and more ambitious anthologies will attempt to work out systematic ways of supplying this language practice.

V. What to Do in the Classroom: Devices and Techniques for Teaching Pronunciation, Composition, and Literature

Betty Wallace Robinett
Simple Classroom Techniques for Teaching Pronunciation

Jesse O. Sawyer
Pronunciation Problems

R. Clyde Yarbrough
Some Problems of Teaching American English to International Students in a Theological Seminary

Dorothy W. Danielson
Teaching Composition at the Intermediate Level

Jean Praninskas
Controlled Writing

Donald Knapp
A Focused, Efficient Method to Relate Composition Correction to Teaching Aims

John Ashmead
Whitman's Wintry Locomotive, Export Model

Simple Classroom Techniques for Teaching Pronunciation

Betty Wallace Robinett

In teaching pronunciation it is seldom sufficient for the student simply to imitate the teacher: the majority of students need more direct help. One helpful device is the simple face diagram in which the various "organs of speech" are shown.

English sounds which can be shown clearly by the use of such diagrams are /θ, ð/ with the tongue between the teeth; /p,b,m/ with the lips completely closed; /t,d/ with the tongue on the tooth ridge; the contrast between /n/ with the tongue on the tooth ridge and /ŋ/ with the tongue against the velum; and the contrast between the "clear" l of *leave* and the "dark" l of *veal.* Even other articulatory movements such as the thrusting outward of the lips in the pronunciation of /š/ in *shoe* or the jaw movement in the /w/ of *wall* can be shown on these so-called "static" diagrams. Moveable face diagrams have been devised by ingenious teachers to show the difference in tongue position between sounds which are frequently confused, such as the /n/ and /ŋ/ sounds.

The points of articulation for the various vowel sounds are less easily taught than those for the consonant sounds because in producing vowel sounds the tongue moves freely without contact within the mouth cavity. If, however, we superimpose a chart of the vowel sounds on a static or face diagram, the student will have a clearer understanding of the relationship between the tongue position and the resulting sound. Here contrast produces effective results. If we are teaching the contrast in *leave* and *live,* for example, we can show through the use of the face diagram that the vowel sound of *leave* is produced with the front of the tongue in a higher and more forward position than the vowel sound of *live*—the important point being not the exact position of the tongue but a difference in height of the tongue.

Flexibility exercises are very desirable to help the student become adept at changes in position of the tongue. General exercises for attaining this flexibility of articulation can be made with the sounds /iy/, /a/, and /uw/. These sounds can be repeated several times in sequence to enable the student to become aware of the movement of his tongue. Then, when he attempts to pronounce such sounds as /iy/ and /i/, in which the tongue movement is less discernible, he will be better able to notice this movement.

Some students have greater difficulty than others in controlling tongue movement. These students often have a greater problem in producing the vowel sound in *live.* It helps these students to use the so-called "bracketing" exercise.[1] That is, the two sounds nearest to the "difficult" one are pronounced in contrast several times: /iy-ey, iy-ey, iy-ey/. Then the tongue is moved to a position approximately midway between these two sounds: /iy-i-ey/.

After the approximate positions of the various vowel sounds have been pointed out by the use of the vowel chart superimposed on the face diagram, the chart itself can be used alone each time a new sound is introduced without the necessity of including a careful drawing of the face. When the students see the chart, they will associate the various vowels with the actual tongue position in the mouth.

Pictures of objects typifying the common contrasts such as *pen* and *pan* or *sheep* and *ship* are especially helpful as visual aids with younger students. With students of any age, the use of minimally different words, "minimal pairs," has been found very effective in teaching the recognition and production of pronunciation elements. Such words can be arranged in lists on the blackboard, and a variety of exercises can be developed with these lists as a basis.

---

[1] Kenneth L. Pike, *Phonemics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947), p. 16.

Using such a contrastive set of words as *sin-thin, sick-thick, sink-think,* the following types of exercises could be used:

a) The teacher pronounces the words in each list and the students repeat them in unison.

b) Individual students are asked to pronounce all the words in one list. If the student encounters difficulty in producing an acceptable production of the sound, the teacher can then give an articulatory description of the sound, using diagrams or charts, bracketing or flexibility exercises in order to help the student attain a more accurate pronunciation.

c) The teacher pronounces pairs of words in contrast, e.g., *sin-thin,* and the students repeat in unison. The falling intonation is used on both words so that the only difference in sound will be that of the sound under practice.

d) The teacher pronounces a word from either list and individual students tell which list it is from.

e) Individual students are asked to pronounce pairs of words in contrast.

f) Individual students are asked to pronounce a word from either list and the teacher tells which list it is from.

g) Individual students are asked to pronounce a word from either list and *another student* tells which list it is from. This student, in turn, pronounces a word and another student tells which list it is from.[2]

As variations on these exercises, the students can be asked to write on a piece of paper the number of the list in which the word appears or the phonemic symbol of the sound under practice.

This same type of minimally contrastive utterance can be extended to include an entire sentence. Again it is essential that the same intonation be used on both sentences. For example, the /ə/ and /a/ contrast could be practiced in the following minimally different sentences:

The *cut* was long.   The *cot* was long.

The techniques described above are usually built into the materials. Now I would like to go on to some specific techniques which are not usually found in published texts.[3]

First, let us consider the vowel sounds.

In teaching the /æ/ sound, emphasis should be placed on the spread position of the lips. This can be achieved by the simple admonition to smile when pronouncing this sound.

The /ə/ sound can be described as that which one makes when he is suddenly hit in the stomach, but it must be made without rounding the lips. This sound can then be contrasted with the /a/ sound by having the students watch the jaw position. The first sound is made with the jaw almost closed and the second with the jaw quite low.

The upward movement of the jaw in the pronunciation of the /ey/ and /ow/ sounds, emphasizing the diphthongal quality of these sounds, should be called to the attention of the students.

---

[2] B. J. Wallace, *The Pronunciation of American English for Teachers of English as a Second Language* (rev. ed.; Ann Arbor: George Wahr Publishing Company, 1957).

[3] Betty Wallace Robinett, *A Workbook in Phonetics and Phonemics of American English.* Unpublished manuscript.

The contrasts between the /iy/ and the /i/ sounds and between the /uw/ and /u/ sounds can be made clearer by the mention of muscular tension. A kinesthetic correlation between clenching the fists when pronouncing the tense sounds and opening and relaxing the hand when pronouncing the lax sounds has been found helpful.

In teaching specific consonant sounds one humorous device which I have used—if I am teaching a group with whom I am using a phonemic alphabet—is to make the /θ/ symbol serve as a memory clue. I enlarge the symbol to represent an open mouth with the crossbar on the symbol acting as the tongue protruding between the teeth.

In teaching the English /r/ sound, presentation of the sound in a certain sequence is important. Here a knowledge of phonetics will help the teacher select the more effective sequence even though this presentation is not built into the materials. The student should first pronounce /a/ and then raise the tip of the tongue slightly being sure that he does not touch the roof of the mouth. If he can do this satisfactorily, he should then be able to practice many words in which the sound appears in post-vocalic position: *car, far, near, door, clear, wear.*

The next step is to be able to produce /r/ before a vowel sound in the word *road* or *read.* Ask the student to pronounce /a/ plus /r/ again, lengthening the /r/ and following it with /ow/ (thus rounding the lips): /a rrrr ow/. Repeat this exercise several times to be sure that the student is not touching the roof of the mouth with his tongue. Then omit the vowel sound before the /r/: /row/.

Lip rounding is an essential part of the pronunciation of the /r/ before vowels and must be emphasized and practiced. Words in which the /r/ appears before rounded vowels should be practiced first. After this, the student is ready to try such words as *read, write, ran, run* in which the vowel sounds themselves are not rounded but the /r/ must be.

The "match trick" is a device which can be used to enable a student to observe whether or not he is producing an aspirated /p/, /t/, or /k/ sound. The student holds a lighted match in front of his mouth and attempts to blow it out as he pronounces a word like *pie.* A piece of paper, not too thick, can be substituted for the lighted match where fire laws prohibit such experimentation—or where nonsmokers do not have matches readily at hand.

The difference between the /s/ and /z/ sounds can be illustrated by comparing them to various hissing and buzzing sounds. The sound which a snake makes, the steam coming from a teakettle, air coming from a tire, illustrate the /s/ sound. The /z/ sound can be made in imitation of a mosquito, an airplane motor, or a power saw.

The pencil trick is helpful in distinguishing between the /n/ and /ŋ/ sounds. The student places a pencil crossways in his mouth and pronounces the words *thin* and *thing.* If he pronounces the /n/ sound accurately, his tongue will touch the pencil for both the /θ/ and the /n/. If he pronounces the /ŋ/ sound accurately, his tongue will touch the pencil for the /θ/ sound but not for the /ŋ/.

Once the individual consonant sounds have been mastered, the problem remains of learning to pronounce these consonants in combinations or clusters. The student may have learned to pronounce the word *wash* with an accurate production of the final consonant sound, but when he needs to use the form *washed,* he encounters a cluster of consonants which may be impossible for him to produce at first trial. We can first ask the student to say *wash two cups* in which the difficult consonant sequence occurs between two words. Then we can change the phrase to *washed a cup* in which the sounds are more closely combined, at the same time pointing out how they can be separated by the following vowel sound: *wash-ta-cup.* This is sometimes referred to as phonetic syllabication. Once the student has learned such phrases as *washed it, looked at it, changed it,* it will be easier for him to produce these sequences before other consonants as in *cashed them, looked for them, changed them.*

Another type of sequential exercise involving consonant clusters is the use of series of words such as *were, word,* and *world.* Beginning with a single final consonant, the student must add one or more consonants to pronounce the other words.

Minimally distinctive sentences containing consonant clusters are also useful. Practice on such pairs of sentences as *they talk about it, they talked about it* or *they learn about it, they learned about it* can be used both for recognition and for production.

Now for some ways of teaching word stress. When students need practice in stressing the right syllable of a word, such familiar words as *table, pronounce, alphabet, important, understand* can be set up as models. Other words are then pronounced, and the student is asked to list them under the proper model.

Many students have difficulty in changing sentence stress when the situation demands it. Using the sentence, *The woman received many letters yesterday,* varied word stress can be elicited through the use of questions. The teacher asks, "What did the woman receive yesterday?" The student answers first, "Letters," and then pronounces the entire sentence with stress only on the word *letters.* Questions with *who* or *when* can be used in the same manner.

The reverse pyramid type of exercise is effective for the teaching of sentence rhythm. English speakers tend to produce stresses at somewhat regularly spaced intervals, thereby necessitating relatively equal amounts of time between the stressed syllables. By starting with a short sentence containing perhaps just two stresses, the sentence can be built up in a reverse pyramid to a relatively long sentence still containing only two stresses but repeated with just about the same amount of time.

The boy's in the house.
The boy's in the old house.
The little boy's in the old house.
The little boy's not in the old house.

It must always be remembered that this is an unnatural type of sequence (we would normally give contrastive stress to the two sentences: the boy's in the house, the boy's in the *old* house, and before the practice period ends, each of the sentences should be put into a natural context. This type of exercise is what Clifford Prator would term manipulative—as so many pronunciation drills necessarily are, in the earlier stages of language learning—but the sentences from a manipulative drill can then be placed in communicative contexts once the purely articulatory difficulties have been overcome.

For practicing intonation, the most successful technique seems to be imitation or mimicry. The use of gestures also seems to give the student a feeling for change in pitch. Showing the direction of the pitch change by raising or lowering the hand seems to help students. I have even had students who used the kinesthetic approach here, lifting a shoulder or raising an eyebrow in imitation of the pitch level.

The falling intonation is sometimes difficult to obtain from students under certain circumstances where the situation demands it. It has been found helpful to begin with the final word in the utterance and to move backward. For example, in the sentence, *Do you want coffee or tea?* the student can first be asked to say *tea* using the falling intonation as if it were an isolated word; then he is asked to say *or tea, coffee or tea, want coffee or tea,* and so on, until the entire sentence has been completed by this backward buildup sort of exercise.

Obviously many of the things that I have been discussing are exaggerated, unnatural kinds of activities which are drills of the type we must use in any skill building process. What has to be remembered is that pronunciation is only one part of this system we call language and must be integrated with the structure and lexicon at every point along the way, in order to produce a speaker who can really be said to have mastered the language.

Pronunciation Problems

Jesse O. Sawyer

Since Americans tend to be uncritical of many foreign accents, the time spent in acquiring an adequate pronunciation can vary from little or nothing to a great deal, with criticism appearing if the emphasis is quite heavy on pronunciation. On the other hand, there are teachers who are willing to demote programs in pronunciation to a very small part of the course activity and no particularly adverse criticism accrues. No one, so far as I know, ignores pronunciation completely, although I am sure that we could find convincing arguments for such an arrangement if we were inclined to that point of view.

At one time a group of which I was a member decided that a student could be abandoned to his mispronunciations when he had reduced his gross phonemic errors to four or five, excluding /s/, /z/, /t/, and /d/, which occur, of course, in crucial inflections in both nouns and verbs under minimal stress.

This rule of thumb seemed to work well enough, but its utility was likely the simple fact of ownership: we had made the rule and we liked it because it was our own. We didn't actually know how to judge the point at which we could stop concentrating on pronunciation. We had merely set an arbitrary point, partly rationalized, at which we chose to discontinue consideration of an annoying problem.

A powerful factor which is rarely mentioned in this connection is the oft-repeated dictum that the student must learn pronunciation first, and when he has achieved a reasonable control of the sounds, he may proceed to the other aspects of the language being studied. Yet it is obvious that the student has already spent a large number of hours developing his mispronunciation. As a matter of fact, he has usually spent several years practicing English (or non-English) before he arrives in the United States. It is obvious that if pronunciation should be learned first, then we are already much too late. It is somewhat surprising that many of our texts offer little help here. They seem rather to pretend that the student has never heard English before and frequently begin with a discussion and presentation of the sounds of English. The teacher approaches each new assault on the pronunciation problem with an ever renewed sinking of the heart.

The teacher, however, is not discouraged by the student's previous training only. He is usually discouraged by the fact that concerted and carefully thought out attacks seem to have rather small effect on the performance that his students achieve. The student sounds at the end of a semester just about as bad as he did to begin with.

In experiments which we worked at a couple of years ago, we discovered that there were differences in the pronunciation skills achieved by some sixty subjects who had studied identical spoken materials for identical numbers of repetition under a variety of conditions. There was no doubt that there were differences in pronunciation; but that any group was better than another was not clear. It appeared that some conditions favored learning one feature and other conditions favored another. It appeared that each individual was capable of learning a certain amount and only a certain amount. Or you could say that each learned what was taught, and the material learned reflected the particular conditions under which the subject studied.

Again we observed that certain pronunciation errors were automatically corrected with no intervention from a teacher once a fair number of repetitions had been reached. On the other hand, certain errors appeared to persist regardless of the number of repetitions. One could characterize pronunciation learning very roughly perhaps by saying that a great deal of learning is evidenced in the first utterances made by the student and a great deal of time may have to be spent to improve on those initial efforts. The importance of the first step is highlighted by some programs which require a period of silent listening before beginning to practice a new language aloud. An error here, of course, would be the conviction that a learner is not practicing his pronunciations until he opens his mouth.

A related question arises as to the effectiveness of oral mimicry. We do not actually know that silent attention might not prove finally as effective in some drills as the current insistence on oral repetition. Certainly one can see a good argument for requiring the student to mimic only those parts of a dialogue or drill with which he can momentarily identify himself. Certainly those materials must be less interesting which are so presented that the student must shift from character to character, unable to associate himself with any single person in the play he is playing.

There is much that is unclear and much that is unknown in this business of dealing with pronunciation problems. If I had to make a positive recommendation, I would say first that it is most important to get the student to feel satisfied with his pronunciation. Regardless of the quality of his speech, he won't learn to improve it if he shudders every time he hears his own voice.

Second, I would urge teachers to limit their goals. Neither the student nor the teacher should face the bleak vastness of the whole problem. An article by Eugène Brière in *Language Learning* describes an interesting experiment in which each student was assigned no more than three major errors to correct in a quarter.[1] Such a policy might help to allay the feeling of discouragement so often found in pronunciation classes—a significant factor if you believe, as I do, that an interested teacher and an eager student are prerequisities to any learning situation.

---

[1] Eugène Brière, "Improving English Speakers' Pronunciation of French," *Language Learning*, XIII, 1 (1963), 33–40.

Some Problems of Teaching American English to International Students in a Theological Seminary

R. Clyde Yarbrough

An Oriental student was reading from the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel which begins with, "In the beginning was the Word." Making the usual "r" substitution, he read the fourteenth verse this way: "And the Word became 'fresh' and dwelt among us."

I am not sure that I have any fresh word concerning the demanding problem of teaching American speech to international students. I do appreciate, however, the tradition of shared ideas in our profession. Consequently, for whatever it is worth, I am glad to present a brief discussion of what is being done at least in one seminary, the Theological Seminary of the University of Dubuque. The discussion is based on work wtih a group of students composed of Koreans, European Indians, American Indians, Japanese, Mexicans, Germans, and a Czechoslovakian. All members of the group are college graduates and range in age from the early 20's to the early 50's. They are training for a bilingual ministry in which they will be conducting services, either in America or in their own countries, or both, in English as well as in their native language—a fact which may or may not intensify the problem of teaching them American English.

The problems seem to fall into two main categories: those which are common with the nontheological state and those which are peculiar to it. The Orientals in the group, for example, present the usual **l-r** problem. All members of the group have the **th** difficulty; each of them substitutes **d** and **t** and one of them additionally substitutes **f** as well. They are plagued by the problems of rhythm and stress. A few of them have difficulty with grammar and sentence structure, and with the formation of plurals and past tenses. Pronunciation, especially the matter of accent and the necessity for unstressing the vowels in running speech, is a problem which each member of the group confronts with varying degrees of consternation.

As for the problems which are peculiar to a theological school, one of the major ones has to do with what might be called "ecclesiastical taint." That is to say, these students have heard with some regularity older preachers, especially American ones, who employ a wailing, effusive, "funereal" delivery that tends to emphasize each word with a full, mournful, awesome "stained glass voice" kind of speech. Hearing this "inflated language and pompous heroics," this "wretched rant," as Petronius would call it, and thinking that it is what American preaching is or should be, these internationals tend to imitate it. The result is an intensified problem of rhythm, pitch, intonation and inflections, and of tone production among other things. The general effect is that of the typical "Holy Joe" delivery.

Concerning a method for solving the problem of ecclesiastical taint, patently such a problem goes deeper than a mere matter of pronunciation or sound substitutions, of sentence structure or accentuation. It seems to have its roots in the psychological and would appear to call for a counseling approach in which an effort is made to help the student understand that preaching—like any concerned, vital, significant communication effort which has information and persuasion as its chief goal—should be conversational, direct, clear, vitally involved at the cerebral level.

Paul Tillich and other theologians and philosophers of stature insist that ours is an age of anxiety. Palpably this is true. But it is also true that we are living in an age of the electronic gadget which, incidentally, may be a tributary cause of our anxiety. You need only take a look at the displays at any of our national conventions or read our professional journals for confirmation of the assertion that our profession endorses this enthronement of the electronic device. So at Dubuque Theological Seminary one of the approaches by which we confront the problem of teaching American English to international students is that of the electronic route. I value, and welcome, as I know you do, anything that holds promise of enabling us to do our job in this area more effectively. However, there really may be some danger, at some points at least, as Herbert Schueller once pointed out, of "bleeding to death from exposure to the cutting edge of progress."

Nonetheless, at Dubuque we follow the leader in the use of mechanization in the attempt to solve the problem of the speech needs of the international student: we make use of a well-equipped foreign language laboratory. We do it, however, with the conviction that its use is more efficacious if it is predicated upon prior work with the instructor in a tutorial milieu which makes possible the "speech of creative interchange." We are persuaded that this setting, where, to use Professor Weiman's phrase, "the total expressiveness of the bodily presence and personality" of the instructor and "the total responsiveness of the bodily presence and personality" of the learner are required, offers some definite pedagogical advantages.

Therefore, those activities that come during the tutoring period and lead into the use of the language lab, and those activities that come after—and may grow out of—the listening and recording exercises are, we feel, of paramount importance in the acquisition of American English by international students.

The tutorial period itself centers on such things as:

1) Description of the problem and the proposed steps for its solution.

2) Demonstration of the "correct" and "incorrect" aspects of the problem.

3) Concentrated work on auditory discrimination (and very little on "tongue-twisters").

4) Stress on production, individual sounds, rhythm, intonation and inflection pattern, and pronunciation—especially as it relates to accentuation; only incidental work with comprehension of written and spoken English.

5) Much drill and repetition, with emphasis on practice exercises which have been devised for the particular individual, using Biblical materials and the Thorndike-Lorge *Teacher's Word Book of 30,000 Words.*

6) Reading from the Bible of selections which seem most applicable to the particular problem at a given time. The lengthy eleventh chapter of the Letter to the Hebrews, for example, is excellent for the **th** difficulty in all three positions.

7) Consultation hours.

The motivational aspect of the task is probably more favorable in a seminary because of such factors as the student's conviction of a "call" and his awareness of being nudged, so to speak, by the Divine.

Teaching Composition at the Intermediate Level

Dorothy W. Danielson

In some aspects, the teaching of composition to speakers of other languages is much the same as teaching basic composition to native speakers. The student must find or be given a topic that he can write about on the basis of his knowledge and experience. He must learn what it means to write on a topic from a particular point of view. He must realize that it is important to organize and to present his material in a certain way in order to communicate effectively with the reader or the readers he has in mind. He must learn the mechanics of writing and be sensitized to style so that what he writes will have the desired effect.

But this is not all. In order to convey his ideas on a variety of topics clearly and effectively, he must also be able to write grammatically correct sentences; he must have a relatively large stock of lexical items and constructions to choose from; and he must be able to pattern his individual choices over an entire composition or piece of writing.

At the elementary level in second-language learning, students usually begin by writing sentences based on constructions and vocabulary items that they have previously heard, spoken, and read. After that comes the writing of paragraphs and simple compositions, still primarily based on material learned through oral practice. At the advanced level, students have generally acquired sufficient control of structure, vocabulary, and the mechanics of writing to write freely on a wide range of topics with a minimum of error. Major attention can be given to organization and presentation of material and stylistic matters. The students at the intermediate level are somewhere between these two points. The problem is to get them from one point to another.

I am of the opinion that there should be a systematic presentation of writing activities at the intermediate level, for it seems somewhat dangerous to me to assume that students will improve their writing ability by simply writing at length about subjects which interest them. It is quite possible, of course, that extensive writing will produce good results in some cases. But it is also possible that it will have little or no effect in others. The type of student, for example, who seems to be satisfied with the degree of minimal communication he has achieved may well perpetuate and compound his errors through extensive writing. You are all, I am sure, acquainted with the student who never seems to profit from the red marks on his paper. As one of my colleagues remarked recently about a student of this type, "His problem is that he writes and talks too much."

The need for control in teaching structure and pronunciation is generally recognized. There is, I believe, a growing recognition of the need for a similar kind of control in the teaching of composition.

The idea of control in composition work is, of course, not new. A really "free" composition is rare. Teachers have, I suppose, since the teaching of composition began, exercised certain controls. Giving a student a topic that he is capable of writing on is a form of control; specifying the organization for a composition is another; writing a paragraph based on a given topic sentence is another; writing a composition or paragraph based on a model is another. But what is needed at the intermediate level is a more systematic application of control, which implies a sequence of writing activities to enable students to write at various stages with as few errors as possible. The intention is also to limit the types of errors so that the student will be able to understand the nature of the errors he makes. If a student is assigned, or chooses, a topic that demands a larger repertory of lexical items and constructions than he commands, he is likely to make not only a large number of errors, but also a number of different types of errors. The student's paper will be difficult for the teacher to correct, and the corrections are almost certain to be confusing to the student.

The amount of control imposed may vary in accordance with the nature of the assignment and the progress of the students. At times the teacher may wish to impose quite rigid control in order to produce a specific response. Here is an example:

> DIRECTIONS: COPY THE FIRST THREE SENTENCES AND COMPLETE THE LAST THREE.
>
> I can't play tennis with you this afternoon. There are several things I have to do. First, I have to finish my homework.
>
> Next__________________________________. Then________________________
> After that____________________________________.

Here is an example of an exercise with less control, designed to give practice in using "would like to take, send, give, etc."

> ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN ONE OR TWO PARAGRAPHS:
>
> What gifts would you like to take the members of your family when you return to your country?
>
> YOU MIGHT BEGIN THIS WAY: When I return to my country, I plan to take gifts to the members of my family. I would like to take my mother____________________.

Here are some exercises in paragraph writing, more or less in order of difficulty: copying, taking dictation, substituting vocabulary items and sentences in a model paragraph, expanding a sentence into a paragraph, building up a paragraph from a final sentence, paraphrasing a rather long, fairly complex paragraph.

The average student at the intermediate level does not have a very large stock of lexical items; he has little more than the basic structures of English to work with, and some of these he does not have entirely under control. In view of this, perhaps much of our attention should be given to the strengthening of structures previously learned and the teaching of constructions the students will need to know if they are to write effectively. Although drills and written exercises may be used to good effect, the practice need not be confined to the writing of isolated sentences and the filling in of blanks. It is possible to choose, to devise, and to adapt short articles and paragraphs which will, along with appropriate exercises and drills, help the student increase his command of constructions and vocabulary.

If reading materials are to be used as the basis for the writing of compositions, it might be well to consider materials which are designed for this level. These materials are more likely to contain vocabulary and structure that the student can use correctly and effectively in his writing. He may be able to read and understand much more difficult material, of course, but we are concerned here with his writing ability, not his reading ability.

One often hears that students are not sufficiently motivated by reading material within their range of ability or by controlled writing activities. One wonders, however, how students can possibly be stimulated by the mutilated papers their teachers return to them when they have attempted to write a composition on a subject that demands much greater control of the language than they at the time possess. Perhaps more importantly, it is difficult to see how students can profit from the correction of so many different types of errors.

Atlhough such matters as choice of topic, organization of material, point of view, and development of style may not be the primary concern of composition work at the intermediate level, they can not be completely ignored, for in order to write even a simple composition, the student must have at least something to say about his topic and must be able to arrange his sentences in such a way as to take the reader smoothly through the material.

The student who has acquired considerable skill in writing his own language is more likely to be aware of, appreciative of, and sensitive to style, format, and effective presentation than the student who has acquired little skill. In the case of the student who writes well in his own language, there will undoubtedly be a transfer of at least some of the skills involved to the writing of English. There may, however, be interference because of a direct carrying over of stylistic devices which are inappropriate in a particular English context. Unfortunately, the student who has acquired little skill in writing his own language will undoubtedly transfer that.

Perhaps fortunately, one is not able to get very far by talking to students at the intermediate level about organization, style, and point of view. One is forced to do something. For example, it is possible to use copying and dictation exercises, two techniques frequently employed in teaching writing at the elementary level, to illustrate the principle of writing from a special point of view, or to call attention to a particular style or format. After the point being illustrated is brought into focus, the student may then be asked to expand the material into a short composition. It is easy to see how this procedure might be used to sensitize the student to style and to the varieties of English.

To my knowledge, there is no evidence to indicate that one method of teaching composition is decidedly superior to another, and there is considerable reason to believe that not all students will learn best by the same method. We should certainly investigate and make use of all techniques and methods that will help the student improve his writing ability. Using a variety of techniques and methods does not, however, preclude a systematic presentation of writing activities and the exercising of control in the teaching of composition at the intermediate level.

Controlled Writing

Jean Praninskas

Perhaps I should start by explaining that the method which will be described here is predicated on the belief that it is possible to learn to write acceptable prose by a series of minute steps, from complete control to no control at all. I am not prepared to argue that this is the best way to teach writing. I can only say that it is one way which often encourages students who are not particularly interested in learning to write, and those who are convinced that they can't.

Last week, in talking to many of the teachers of foreign students on campuses throughout the country, I found to my dismay that by far the great majority keep foreign students in remedial classes "until they are *ready* for Freshman Composition." In these remedial classes they practice simple question and answer patterns, contractions, tag questions, dialogues—all the forms they need to master for satisfactory conversation. How does this prepare them for writing themes? Well, it doesn't! We don't write themes by joining a number of conversational statement patterns with a lot of transitional glue such as *however, inasmuch as,* and *because of the fact that.* Prose style sentences are different from conversational sentences and fragments. They are usually more precise, and they frequently express relationships which are more complex than those expressed by single sentences in speech. Furthermore, they are combined into paragraphs in ways that complement and supplement one another.

If the language learner is going to learn to write such sentences and paragraphs, he must first become aware of them as units. Consequently, the material needed for a course in controlled writing, as I conceive it, is a good stock of well-developed model paragraphs on a level of sophistication suitable for the age group of the students, dealing with topics which engage their interest. I can find such paragraphs for my students in the summaries of their textbooks, in technical journals, *The Scientific American, U.S. News and World Report, The Farm Journal, The Wall Street Journal,* etc. I wouldn't attempt to suggest to anyone working with a different group of students where to find his material, but I do suggest that he *not* look for it among the writings of the students' peers—as is, alas, so often done. In teaching speech, we guide our students to imitate the pronunciation and the grammar patterns of the socially acceptable educated speakers. Is it not equally important to encourage them to emulate the writing of our most articulate writers?

And now some comments on the size of the steps. Perhaps you will be surprised to learn that I define *completely* controlled writing as copying from one page to another. And by that I don't mean transcribing from a printed page to script—for that is already another step and one which is very difficult for some learners, particularly those who are conditioned to a completely different writing system.

It seldom happens that I can utilize, directly, this first step in controlled writing—for psychological reasons, because I teach college students, most of whom have had at least ten years of English training, and it is just too shocking for them to learn that they can not copy without making many errors of which they are unaware. Occasionally, however, when placement examinations indicate that simple copying is needed, I insidiously work it into the beginning of my program by having students copy something which I write on the blackboard. If many errors are made, and frequently they are, I continue with the second step by having students copy from the textbook certain paragraphs which I particularly wish to call to their attention, such as "study hints." Two, or at most three, assignments of this type prove to be the maximum that an adult student can tolerate, but even one will often serve the purpose of convincing him that many of the errors he makes are due not so much to carelessness, as he thought, but to lack of knowledge of the details of the written language.

The next step after copying is more copying, but this time with minimal changes. I have never worked out any order of assigning the various changes because in my teaching situation this differs with the language background of the learners.

Suppose, for instance, that I am teaching a class of Turks. Even some very advanced Turkish students have a great deal of trouble with pronoun forms. Step 3 in the controlled writing method for these students is to present them with a paragraph-long narrative about a male character and have them change it to a paragraph about a female character. They are advised to keep the sentence structure exactly the same throughout and to change only those forms and lexical items which must be changed to make the paragraph reasonable.

While doing this exercise, the student gets maximal practice with pronoun forms and at the same time often learns some semantic distinctions of masculine and feminine lexical items not before called to his attention. But in addition to this, he is forced to analyze the situational relationships, as distinct from the grammatical relationships, which are expressed by the various components of the complex sentences. Once he realizes that the substitution he makes in slot *b* must be related to the substitution he has made in slot *a* in such a way that *b* is a characteristic of *a*, or the occupation of *a*, or the environment of *a*, or a limitation upon *a*, he is farther along in his ability to construct reasonable English prose sentences than he will ever become from listening to a dozen lectures on subordination.

With the Chinese student, I start with the substitution of number rather than with gender, for number is a much greater problem for him. Many different types of paragraphs may be used for the exercise in changing number, and the same paragraph may be used more than once with the number reference of different entries being changed. The change may be made from singular to dual with the consequent forcing of the dual expressions *both, both of them, one* and *the other, each other*; or from singular to multiple with the opportunity to use *some, a few of, one* and *the others, one another;* or, even better, from plural to singular, where it becomes an exercise in the use of the definite and indefinite articles.

Basic to this type of exercise is the actual repetition of whole sentences and whole paragraphs each time a substitution is made. In the classroom, students may make substitutions while reading aloud, though I have found that a certain amount of supervised writing is important also. Above all, it is important to get the cooperation of the student in avoiding his going through and mechanically changing forms. I advise my students to vocalize the sentences as they copy them, and occasionally I prepare tapes for them of the original model paragraphs presented in constituent breath groups with pauses long enough for writing from dictation. There should be enough work with one paragraph that the students literally memorize it without ever being assigned to do so. Needless to say, such a paragraph must be carefully chosen for appeal of content as well as for excellence of style. Without question the most difficult part of presenting such a course is the choice or preparation of the model paragraphs.

As a next step I suggest a substitution in time reference. This gives practice not only in manipulation of tense and grammatical sequence of tenses but also in numerous adverbial expressions: *the week after next, the night before last, the day after tomorrow, two months ago, in a little while, before the committee had had time to fully consider the consequences of its decision, during the interim, in recent years. . . .*

There are several more kinds of manipulations possible which I frequently employ before turning students loose to compose their own paragraphs on different topics, using the model only for sentence and paragraph style.

Direct statements may be changed into reported statements; third person reports may be expressed in the first person. Passive voice constructions may be made active, actives passive—and in this instance students may be required to express their emotional or intellectual responses, if any, to the change. Paragraphs expressing conditions may be altered to express different or even opposite conditions—in which case all the consequences may change, though the sentence and paragraph structure may remain intact or change only minimally.

What actually happens while all these manipulations are being made? Well, many things. For one, the student frequently learns a number of new lexical items, and very often he sharpens up distinctions between ones he already knows, or thinks he knows. Another thing that happens is that the student builds up self-confidence in his use of the language even though he may have decided before the beginning of the course that he is one of the least linguistically oriented people in the world. This confidence comes from his being able to execute the assignments with some success—because for the first few assignments he is concentrating on only one or two manipulations. And later, when he has several changes to make at one time, they all involve operations which he has already practiced in isolation. But the most important thing that happens with this method, it seems to me, is that the students repeat, over and over and over again—with their vocal organs and with their eyes and their whole nervous systems, with their fingers and with their wrists—the sentence patterns and paragraph patterns which are widely used and highly esteemed by writers within our language community.

A Focused, Efficient Method to Relate Composition Correction to Teaching Aims

Donald Knapp

The checklist system I am going to recommend rests on four assumptions: (1) that composition teachers aren't proofreaders and shouldn't be; (2) that it is a mistake in itself to mark all the mistakes in a student's composition; (3) that the correction of grammatical errors is only a subsidiary aim in teaching composition; and (4) that giving a composition a grade is unnecessary and undesirable.

I plan to begin by setting out what we might agree on as desirable qualities in a system of composition correction. Then I hope to show how the checklist that accompanies this paper can be used to meet a good many of these requirements. Since you will probably agree that a perfect system of composition correction is too much to expect, I will try in the last part of the paper to suggest additional techniques that will compensate for the system's imperfections and blend with the checklist to make a workable system, one that can be recommended to you as "a focused, efficient method to relate composition correction to teaching aims."

The value of any new system for teaching or correcting composition has to be determined by how well it does what we want done, and at what cost. The problem is to find a system that recognizes the time limits within which we teachers work but that also clearly helps the students expand the use of their present patterns in clear expository writing.

First, looking at composition, especially composition correction, from the student's point of view, the corrections and grades ought to be fair; they ought to represent what the student has achieved in *this* course, based on the material taught by *this* teacher, rather than by a penalty for what the student didn't learn or wasn't taught in previous classes. There ought to be a feeling that the course is going somewhere, that there is a body of knowledge or a set of skills that can reasonably be learned with the syllabus (as outlined in the checklist) in the time allowed. The teacher and the student should both be able to state quite definitely at any particular time what more is to be done in order to reach the course goals. Corrections ought to set reasonable tasks that the student can perform without much chance of error and with the expectation of learning something.

To the teacher, there are additional considerations that a desirable system of composition teaching and correcting should reflect. Let's assume that programers are right and that learning is done in discrete units; if that is so, then a good system for composition teaching and correction ought to help break down the complex of composition skills into learnable units. At very least, a good system of composition correction should isolate specific skills as units for focus so they can be taught efficiently.

Related to this is another assumption supported by recent research in the psychology of learning, namely that people are more apt to learn from their successes than their failures, that positive reinforcement of right choices is most apt to increase learning efficiency. This suggests that composition assignments ought to be structured so as to insure right choices in what is being taught, and the teacher's correction should involve search for successes rather than proofreading for mistakes.

At the same time, though, a desirable system should not mislead a student into thinking that he had mastered more than in fact he has. Grades should reflect achievement against some absolute standard; they shouldn't be mixed up with encouragement and thus be rendered meaningless. Ideally each returned composition should show what the student had done well against a background of what he still needed to learn in order to complete the course satisfactorily.

There are clearly more criteria that we could set up for a desirable system of composition correction, but perhaps we should now look at the checklist, one that has grown out of previous work with checklists at Teachers College by Gerald Dykstra, Emma Rutherford, and others.

Name______________________________ Date______________

Subject______________

COMPOSITION CHECKLIST

Rough Outline
+ A clear thesis statement that can be supported or proved
Three or more useful supporting points

Rough Draft
Shows examples of thoughtful editing

Final Draft
Mechanics give a clean, orderly impression
The title—is correctly capitalized
—shows imagination in phrasing
—indicates the subject clearly
+ Adequate margins—sides, top, bottom
+ Clear indentation for paragraphs
+ Clear, easy-to-read handwriting or typing
Logical development of one idea in a paragraph
A topic sentence that gives the idea of the paragraph
A clear controlling idea in the topic sentence
Supporting statements that focus on the controlling idea
Clear relationship or transition between sentences
Imaginative, precise use of language
Connectives used with precision to show relationship (1)
Careful, correct use of expanded vocabulary (2)
Examples of artful phrasing (3)
Correct spelling and hyphenating (4)
Correct punctuation to develop the meaning of sentences (5)
Good use of parallel structure in series (6)
Good use of phrases or clauses to modify or to tighten the expression of an idea (7)
Good selection of detail to suggest larger meaning (8)
A good conclusion that draws the paragraph together (9)
Good idea content
A clearly expressed idea, easy for the reader to understand
An interesting idea, worthy of adult communication
Challenging, original thinking
Corrections—with adequate practice to insure mastery
Corrections under all ''Red Marks''
Spelling: 5 times + used in five sentences. Listed.
Focus items used in at least 10 true sentences. Listed.

Teachers College, Columbia University

DONALD KNAPP

This checklist has been used with intermediate and advanced students, most of whom had written few compositions before taking a course in composition in this country. They had mastered most of the basic structures of English, but almost all of these students retained serious trouble spots that reflected their native language backgrounds. Most were not aware of topic sentences, supporting statements focusing on the central idea of the paragraph, transitional elements, and the like, even in their own languages; in their introductory compositions they generally paid little attention to formal requirements or mechanics.

This composition checklist acts as the syllabus for the course. Were you to adopt it for your own course, it would certainly need revision to fit your own particular teaching aims. Copies of it are distributed at the beginning of the term with an explanation that the final evaluation of the student's work at the end of the course will be based on how well he is able to show evidence (in compositions written in class) of having mastered all the items. It is made clear, though, that the first compositions will focus on only a few of the items, with the other items added cumulatively as they are treated in class.

For example, the first week of class work might center on only the four following items on the checklist: "A clear thesis statement that can be supported or proved" which is the first item under **Rough Outline,** and the items that deal with margins, indentation, and clear writing that come under the heading *Mechanics give a clean, orderly impression.* In class the students are shown examples of well-done thesis statements, and compositions with adequate margins, clear paragraph indentation, and easy-to-read handwriting or clean typing; then they practice recognizing the items—or the lack of them—in written work supplied to the class for examination (perhaps from last year's compositions). And finally, before they are assigned thesis statements and paragraphs for homework, the students practice writing and criticizing thesis statements and copying paragraphs with good mechanics until they know what is expected of them. They are asked to make checks on the Composition Checklist next to those items which have been taught in that class session to remind themselves that those are the items they will be expected to show mastery of when they turn in their homework at the next class session.

In correcting the composition, the teacher has three goals. The first is to see that the student has been able to use successively those items which were singled out for attention in class (and in later corrections, also those items which the teacher had previously covered in class). If the student has done well—and the teacher is probably giving inadequate preparation if most students don't do well on these items taught—the teacher marks a red plus sign in front of the item on the Composition Checklist to indicate that it was well done. A particularly fine job might rate a double plus, but there are no negative marks and there is no general grade given the paper. In each succeeding class session, more items are taught; since the process is cumulative, by midterm probably all the items on the top half of the checklist, together with those under **Corrections** and a few under *Imaginative, precise use of language* should regularly be receiving red plus signs. Usually the student and the teacher enjoy a solid sense of achievement as the number of red plus marks grows from week to week. Besides, the student is always conscious of how much of the syllabus has been covered and thus how much he has achieved, over against how much is expected of him.

Never in my experience with the use of these checklists, even with students with very grade-conscious backgrounds, has there been a request for a letter grade: something more meaningful has been substituted. Another gratifying result is frequent student initiative in asking for help on a specific point if one of the items the student is responsible for remains without a red plus mark after two or three tries.

I am sure some teachers will want to ask: What is done about mistakes? Are they just left unmarked and uncorrected with no indication to the student that there may be serious flaws in his writing? No. Together with the checklist and perhaps some short note or comment on what the composition communicated—something to acknowledge the writer's personality and his ideas as well as to establish a communicating relationship between the teacher and the student—there are two other procedures which have been helpful, both of them concerned with outright mistakes.

The first is a "Red Mark List" of items which the class, during the first few sessions, agrees could only be careless mistakes. Forgotten terminal punctuation, capitals, or *-s* endings for present tense third person singular verbs are the kind of mistake I mean. The teacher underlines such errors as a reminder of carelessness and no further issue is made of them, except in extreme cases, when the student may be asked to count the number of red mark mistakes and put in the upper right-hand corner as a confession of sloppiness. A caution is necessary, though: the teacher needs to be sure that red mark items are on a level that truly reflects carelessness only. If the same error is made consistently, it may be that elementary as this mistake is, it has been overlooked or unlearned at an earlier stage of English language learning and will have to be treated now as a new pattern to be learned.

A second procedure to deal with pattern mistakes and others of a non-compositional nature is to revert to individual written pattern drill. Here it is important that the teacher mark only as many mistaken patterns as the student can truly master independently in the interval between compositions; then the teacher needs to set up the kind of written drill that could be effective in helping the student remove this mistake from his writing. In most cases, this focused correction would involve underlining a mistaken pattern—perhaps with the mistaken word or ending crossed out—and then writing the correct pattern in the margin with a star to identify it.

The student is expected to write an additional ten to perhaps thirty or forty *true* sentences using each corrected "starred" pattern until he feels sure that he has mastered it. To make this drill homework easier for the teacher to check, the sentences are written on a separate sheet of paper headed with the correct pattern. In this way the checking can be done quickly, but it should be done only to see that *that* pattern is used correctly, not to check on all the other possibilities for mistakes.

This practice in writing meaningful sentences using the now-correct pattern is admittedly only a single, beginning pattern drill, so the student is also asked to copy the correct pattern on a patterns-to-be-learned list. Each week he can be asked to write sentences, each of which uses a pattern from the patterns-to-be-learned list. A requirement that each sentence be meaningful and verifiable will make the sentences more interesting both in the writing and in the correcting, and will help avoid useless nonsense like "I have few lions; I have few tigers," etc. This course-long review is essential for intermediate students; without it, a student often sinks back into the original mistake in just a few weeks.

That only two or three mistakes are treated this way in each composition means, however, that there are still many mistakes that are not corrected. Because of this, it is made clear to the students from the start that even their corrected compositions can not be thought of as models; instead, the compositions have been focused exercises in writing with perhaps the added interest of communicating with the teacher and practicing the use of English in the form in which they ultimately will need to use it.

There is an additional important advantage to the teacher in being able to focus on only a few mistakes rather than cataloging them all: cases where the use of the construction is only questionable, or where the pattern itself is not wrong but it probably doesn't communicate what the student intended, or where the pattern mistake seems almost impossible to unravel from a whole confused paragraph, the mistake can be passed over until it appears in a context that makes it a clear teaching example. Rather unhelpful comments like "awkward" or "rewrite" can be abandoned, as can the long explanatory notes we sometimes feel we need to write in order to help the student understand our corrections. This focus on what is best teachable in its most self-evident context in a composition not only makes for better teaching but also speeds correction.

To sum up, this checklist method of composition correction tries for efficiency and focus in the following ways:

1) It eliminates proofreading, in favor of marking only those items that have teaching significance.

2) It provides for sufficient teaching and drill on the points to be learned so that they *are* learned, not just introduced or acknowledged.

3) It means that even grammar points ~~and~~ punctuation can be taught *when the teacher is ready to teach them,* and in the clearest, most favorable contexts.

4) It is structured to reinforce what the students *want* to remember and practice—their successes—instead of trying to force them to remember and learn from their failures.

5) It makes basic composition into a course with knowable, achievable goals.

6) It offers both the student and the teacher specific evidence that progress is being made—and how much.

7) It lets the student feel he is being judged on this present achievement, not on his misspent past.

8) It eliminates the need for grading; in its stead it gives more precise evaluation of achievement in the separate composition skills.

9) The evaluation is direct and honest in terms of composition skills; it can be easily supported by the teacher and accepted and respected by the students.

10) It changes the teacher's correction attitude from one of looking for error and failures to one of looking for successes—and the students feel the difference.

Whitman's Wintry Locomotive, Export Model

John Ashmead

Three events, which are not meant to be of equal significance, have led me to puzzle about a possible export model of a literary locomotive.

One hot rainy day in Taiwan, during a season which was only chronologically parallel to a Philadelphia-Camden winter, I found myself explaining to some thirty very able Chinese students the meaning of Whitman's poem, "To a Locomotive in Winter." On Taiwan my Chinese students still had steam locomotives, but they had snow. My American students of the previous year had more than adequate supplies of snow, but no steam locomotives. I had lost a little snow in China, but had I gained a trustworthy locomotive there?

My second event was the actual writing of Whitman's poem.

On February 27, 1874, a little more than a year after his paralytic stroke, Whitman, who was often confined to his Camden house, wrote to his good friend Peter Doyle (who worked on the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad):

> I amuse myself by seeing the locomotive,
> & trains go by—I see them very plainly
> out of the back window—they are only
> 7 or 800 feet off—they go by constantly—
> often one right after another—I have got
> used to them & like them—

Perhaps at that time, Whitman wrote the twenty-five lines of his poem "To a Locomotive in Winter," published 1876, the first, or almost the first significant American poem on a locomotive.[1]

My third event—it was really more of a process—was the change in the size of American locomotives from the 1850's to the 1870's. To sum these up, in the 1870's there was a striking increase in power, in length (five to fifteen feet longer), in height (two feet higher at the boiler and the stack), and especially in size and number of driving wheels, to as many as eight drivers and two or four leader wheels, the drivers now being five feet high. A cab was provided for the locomotive engineer, in contrast to the open platform of English engines, and the whole boiler was ingeniously arranged in a flexible frame (hence Whitman's word "knitted") which tilted the engine toward the inside of any curve, thus counteracting the effect of centrifugal force.[2] Accompanying this change was the recognition of the locomotive as the symbol of the modern age—as Whitman called it in his poem, "Type of the modern, emblem of motion and power."

---

[1] Emily Dickinson's "I Like to See It Lap the Miles" was probably written in 1862 but was not published till after her death.

[2] I am indebted to G. F. Cronkhite's excellent note "Walt Whitman and the Locomotive," *American Quarterly*, VI (1954), 164–172, for pointing out the connection between locomotive development and Whitman's "To a Locomotive in Winter." From the newly published Whitman letters in Gay W. Allen and Sculley Bradley (eds.), *The Collected Writings of Walt Whitman* (New York: New York University Press, 1961 and later), I have added some further details. See also John A. Kouwenhoven, *Made in America* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Book, 1962), p. 30.

From these three events I would like to develop a theory for the teaching of English abroad which will satisfy linguists and humanists alike, which will be reasonably aware in its linguistics, and reasonably rich in cultural reference. I must confess here that I am a linguistic agnostic, and wander in and out of the sectarian churches of Chomsky, Fries, Harris, and others as I choose.

I sum up these suggestions under three headings: vocal, visual, and verbal.

Although there is growing agreement among linguists and metrists that essentially the art of metrics consists of balancing the phonetic/phonemic sounds against an imposed aesthetic pattern of verse, this subject is too complex for presentation now. For practical purposes, a characteristic Trager-Smith analysis of four stresses, in which any adjacent greater stress is counted as ictus and any lesser stress as no ictus, will work admirably well.[3]

If we look at the riming, we notice first of all identical rime, often used to link together lines of quite different lengths, and very often at the beginning of lines. "Thee" (3x), "Thy" (9x), "By" (2x). But we observe too a steady echoing of /ay/, centering on /sayd-barz/ /jayreyting/ (line 5); /drayving/ /diyklayning/ (line 2); /Thay/ (lines 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10) (3x), 11, 16, 17, 19 (2x), (20,23) and /Bay/ (lines 16, 17); /hed-layt/ line 7; /bihaynd/ (line 11); /Tayp/—another key word (line 13); /Ay/ (line 14); the striking four times repetition in /Bay nayt thay saylent/ (line 17); /layk/ (line 20); /thayself/ /thayn/ (line 25). In terms of sounds, surely the "gyrating" "side bars," and the locomotive as "type" of the modern must be termed summative words, around which the alliteration centers and clusters.

But the constructor of literary export models will soon learn in connection with onomatopoeia that one country's ding dong is another country's goose cry, and so I omit that familiar *American* classroom topic.

A complex topic which can only be hinted at here is Whitman's use, in such phrases as "and thy beat convulsive," of words with a weakly stressed final syllable ("convulsive") in the rising intonation contour of a series. The result is that the weak syllable must have the highest pitch, and so we have syncopation of pitch against stress, a good way of giving the irregular beat of a straining locomotive. Less controversial as analysis is the obvious irregularity of lines in length (whether counted by words, phonemes, or syllables); many critics have remarked that the poem by its use of this effect seems—phonologically—to *be* a locomotive speaking.

Thoreau once wrote in *Walden* that he was "determined to know beans." In a poem about a locomotive, and locomotives of the past at that, we must be determined to know locomotives. We are helped by the fact that in American culture, painting and literature have often had close associations. Witness the novelist Cooper, the poet Bryant, and the Hudson River School of painting; or the so-called Ashcan School of painting (Henri, Luks, Shinn, and others) and the novelist Dreiser.

A number of Currier and Ives prints of the '60's and '70's reflect two parts of locomotive iconography: (1) its newly increased power, as in "*Lightning Express*"

---

[3] Some key articles and books: (1) George Hemphill (ed.), *Discussions of Poetry, Rhythm and Sound* (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1961). This inexpensive collection of articles works very well in class and is not doctrinaire in approach. (2) Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1960). Contains a number of helpful articles (see those by Lotz, Chatman, and Hrushovski) as well as a good bibliography to 1960. (3) *Poetics* (s'Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1961). Outrageously overpriced, but with a number of significant articles (for example those by Thompson and Masson). (4) B. F. Skinner, *Cumulative Record* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961). Important for its relation of alliteration, and indeed all riming devices, to the behavioristic psychologist's concept of formal strengthening. (5) On Whitman's own metrical practice, which was extremely regular, see Lois Ware, "Poetic Conventions in *Leaves of Grass*," *Studies in Philology*, XXVI (January 1929), 45–57. This useful article sticks to the facts. More recent articles and books easily found in any Whitman bibliography show no awareness of modern linguistics.

Trains (1863) or *American Express Train* (1864), (2) its ability to span a continent, as in *Across the Continent* (1868).[4]

The visual image helps us to realize that Whitman, I think, had begun to realize the uniqueness of American machinery. Not only were locomotives improved in this span of time, from the 1850's to the 1870's, but other American industrial objects became well known. *Two Rivulets,* the volume in which "To a Locomotive in Winter" appeared, was intended for the Philadelphia Centennial. It includes "Song of the Exposition" which celebrates American wire nails and other previously unpoetic and unmanufactured objects.

In 1851 the American exhibit as the Crystal Palace in England had been very much criticized, with the exception of Power's *The Greek Slave,* the Colt Revolver, and a new kind of patent lock. Americans then realized that, in spite of their brilliant work on interchangeable parts (called the American system), European manufacturers were far ahead especially in machine tools. Without outlining a complicated history that includes the impetus of the Civil War, we may say that by 1867 and the Paris International Exposition, suddenly American machine tools were judged superior, so much so that when the American Centennial came round, many of the foreign tools exhibited there had in fact been developed from copies of American machine tools. And just as had happened with machine tools, so American locomotives changed remarkably.

American success is to be explained by American pragmatism, the spirit of "cut and try," which enabled them to make striking innovations in all machinery design.[5]

Helpful though the visual image of the locomotive is, in showing its transition from an almost comic shape with an upright teakettle boiler, to the long, massive, yet flexible engine of the 1870's, we must go to the semantics of "To a Locomotive in Winter" for a final analysis of the poem. For the semantics warns us that Whitman is not merely writing on increased horsepower, or American technical mastery.

We can begin our analysis by looking at the actual syntax of the 1874-5 poem. The word "Recitative" in the first line warns us that we may expect in its group of seventeen lines the equivalent of an operatic recitative or chanted part. As so often in Whitman, this whole section is a sentence and we must locate its grammatical kernel (11.13–14):

> Type of the modern—emblem of motion and power—
>   pulse of the continent.
> For once come serve the Muse and merge in verse . . .

We have an obvious imperative addressed to the locomotive as "Type of the modern." But who is the Muse, and why should the locomotive serve her? I suspect the answer lies in the fact that "To a Locomotive" is a successor poem to "Song of the Exposition."

---

[4] See Cronkhite, p. 169, who states that half of the Currier and Ives prints of locomotives came in the 1870's and tended to glamorize the engine itself.

See also Edward C. Kirkland, *Men, Cities and Transportation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948); appropriate sections of *A History of Technology,* Vols. IV and V (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958); Joseph Harrison, *The Locomotive Engine & Philadelphia's Share in Its Early Improvements* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia, 1872, O.P.), plate facing p. 52 gives a good idea of the modern locomotive Whitman saw; William H. Brown, *The History of the First Locomotives in America* (rev. ed.; New York, 1874, O.P.) furnishes good plates of several of the earliest locomotives (pp. 146, 154).

A number of Currier and Ives locomotive prints are reproduced in Harry Twyford Peters, *Currier & Ives: Printmakers to the American People* (Garden City, N.Y., 1942, O.P.): Plates 19, 32, 38, 65, 188. Many were advertisements, such as one of two trains about to have a head-on collision, with the name of a reliable insurance firm listed on the head car. For sources of color slides, see Sandak, 135 W. 41st Street, New York City, New York 10036 (see slides GB 150C, GB 149B); University Prints (for prints), 15 Brattle Street, Harvard Square, Cambridge 38, Mass.

[5] Here I wish to acknowledge indebtedness to Professor Monte Calvert of the University of Pittsburgh and to John Maass, Visual Presentation Director, City of Philadelphia, and to their as yet unpublished papers on American technological advances in this period; these papers were delivered at the April 1964 meeting of the American Studies Association of the Middle Atlantic States.

That poem was written for an industrial exhibition of 1871 with a preface advocating "the establishment of a great *permanent* Crystal Palace of Industry from an imaginative and Democratic point of view. . . ." Later it was used by Whitman for the Centennial of 1876. There Whitman identifies the Muse for us:

Come Muse migrate from Greece and Ionia,
Cross out please those immensely overpaid accounts,
That matter of Troy and Achilles' wrath, and Aeneas', Odysseus' wanderings,
Placard ''Removed'' and ''To Let'' on the rocks of your snowy Parnassus. . . .

Now perhaps we can see that "To a Locomotive in Winter" might also read, "To the Muse of Machine Poetry in Winter." All other lines, syntactically speaking, depend on these two. And if the locomotive is the subject, surprisingly enough, the Muse of Machine Poetry is the object.

The later poem "To a Locomotive in Winter" is not then merely about the perfected locomotive of the '70's nor is it entirely an attempt to compensate for Whitman's forced semi-inactivity. Rather it is the continuing development of a theme presented in 1871 in "Song of the Exposition." It is an attempt to enrol the locomotive, as *type of the modern,* in the service of the Muse of poetry.

For conclusion we must try to put together visual, verbal, and vocal. The completely irregular lines, proceeding, like the starting chug of a locomotive, now long, now short, convey on the printed page, to the ear, and by their syntax, the eccentric locomotive motion. Many similar details of this kind cut across all three categories. But of many such examples, one of the best for our purposes is "Thy ponderous side-bars."

We may remember that the /p/ and /ay/ sounds are significant as alliteration and as summative sounds. "Side-bars," a compound whose first syllable is the stronger, has been placed in a series in which its second and weaker syllable would necessarily be given higher pitch (level 3 at least), followed by rising juncture (↗), and so its syncopation contributes to the "convulsive beat," which Whitman wished to have roll through his chant.

Visually we are looking at double and perhaps triple driving wheels connected by these side-bars, and with parallel and connecting rods which are gyrating back and forth; these are all moving parts (made clear in the diagram in *Webster's Second* "locomotive"). Many of the features Whitman describes were invented or perfected in America, notably in the flourishing railroad factories of Philadelphia. They were a tribute to newly triumphant American methods of manufacture, and they made it possible for an American locomotive to span the continent, and thus complete a new definition of the world. It was the American type of locomotive which was adopted in Russia, and not the English.[6]

It is the side-bars which finally transmit, to the wheels and to the poem, the "pulse of the continent." Vocally or phonologically, by means of syncopated pitch against stress, by the use of summative alliteration around this crucial compound word, and visually, by association of side-bars with its visual image of the new locomotive, we can sense the importance of this key word.

Verbally, the words which contain the syntactic energy of the poem are almost certainly the "verbals" themselves (to use an old-fashioned term). There are an extraordinary number of these (21 out of some 270 words in all): driving, declining, throbbing, connecting, gyrating, shuttling, swelling, tapering, protruding, floating, outbelching, following, careering, buffeting, warning, ringing, swinging, echoing, rumbling, rousing, holding.

---

[6] See Roger Burlingame, *Engines of Democracy* (New York, 1940, O.P.) pp. 35–36; Charles Barnard, "English and American Locomotives," *Harper's*, LXVIII (March 1879), 555–559.

To say so much is to examine verbal significances *within* the poem; but if we consider the larger verbal significance, as we have just tried to explain, Whitman was not merely attempting to show—vocally, visually and verbally—the new power of American machinery, nor was he compensating for his own enforced illness. Rather he was suggesting a whole new direction for American literature, first foreshadowed by Emerson in *The Poet* (1844) but now at last fulfilled. For this greatest triumph of American machinery should also now satisfy the Muse.

We have come some distance from a hot rainy day in Taiwan, from an ailing but valiant poet watching the Camden railroad yards in a snowstorm, from the American railroad shops that improved and manufactured an engine that literally went round the world, as the type and emblem of motion. In this one poem we have tried to watch the first emergence of the new poetry of energy and the machine. It is no accident that T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, even the latest beatnik poetry, all freely return to Whitman.

Perhaps you will think that, like the locomotive of the Poem, I have madly whistled you down my own lawless track. But by this analytical categorization of vocal, visual, and verbal, I have tried, as the transformational linguists might say, to generate any and all wintry locomotives of Whitman—in the export model.